

AGE

THE
NEW RITUALISTIC DIVINITY

NEITHER

THE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE AND PRAYER-BOOK NOR OF
THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH;

BEING

A DEFENSE

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
IN PENNSYLVANIA

AGAINST THE ATTACK OF

HENRY FLANDERS, Esq.,
OF THE PHILADELPHIA BAR.

BY

DANIEL R. GOODWIN,
PRESBYTER.

PHILADELPHIA:

ALLEN, LANE & SCOTT, BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS,
No. 233 South Fifth Street.
1879.

263

1
G635

263.1

G635



263.1

G635

263.1

THE
NEW RITUALISTIC DIVINITY

NEITHER

THE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE AND PRAYER-BOOK NOR OF
THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH ;

BEING

A DEFENSE

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
IN PENNSYLVANIA

AGAINST THE ATTACK OF

HENRY FLANDERS, Esq.,
OF THE PHILADELPHIA BAR.

BY

DANIEL R. GOODWIN,
PRESBYTER.

PHILADELPHIA:

ALLEN, LANE & SCOTT, BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS,
No. 233 South Fifth Street.
1879.

To the Clergy and Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in
the Diocese of Pennsylvania, this Defense is respectfully inscribed.

FEAST OF THE EPIPHANY, 1879.

DEFENSE OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN PENNSYLVANIA.

1163

A LITTLE after last midsummer, a pamphlet appeared from the pen of a highly-esteemed layman, Mr. George W. Hunter, "proposing to inquire what the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States *does* really teach and hold concerning the Holy Eucharist and Auricular Confession." He starts out with stating Dr. De Koven's doctrine of Eucharistic Adoration, and, as we understand him, defends it without reserve, holding that "if it is not Protestant to adore Christ in the Eucharist, so much the worse for Protestantism." He declares that "the Reformers and their immediate successors do not profess to differ from Rome in the matter of confession and the real presence in the Holy Eucharist, warding off only the abuse of defining the mode in one, and of making the other absolutely necessary to salvation. They held to the priesthood and the power of the Keys. They taught as Rome teaches on Baptism and Confirmation."

These are the real issues distinctly formulated, and they are constantly to be remembered in any further discussion. The party that holds the doctrines thus set forth he claims to constitute seven-tenths of the Church, and to have on their side nearly all the divines whose fame survives. As compared with their

opponents, he declares that "the one is the stronger, the other the noisier;" the one interprets honestly, "the other picks and chooses, omits and alters, puts forced interpretations upon and laughs history and facts to scorn. The one studies, the other prates. The one appeals to the Bible and to the consent of all Christians from the Apostles' time to this; admitting no break, holding on to the old creeds and confessions, and liturgies and usages. The other acts from the whim of the moment, and has no root in the past; and, in fact, is in earnest and complete ignorance of it. It don't [doesn't?] reason; it don't reflect; it don't put things together. It knows nothing about harmony, or fitness, or proportion."

These assertions, whatever may be said of their large-mindedness, their fairness, and courtesy, and Christian consideration, or their regard for harmony, or fitness, or proportion, are not the real issues. It is not necessary to reply. It might not be seemly to retort.

The Rev. Dr. Currie followed with a temperate and courteous answer to Mr. Hunter's pamphlet, in which he confined himself to the questions in debate, and indulged in no personal or party recriminations.

And now we have a reply to the Rev. Dr. Currie, published about the 1st of December last, by Henry Flanders, Esq., of the Philadelphia bar, in a pamphlet, entitled "Pennsylvania Protestant Episcopalianism not the Religion of the Bible and Prayer-Book." He opens by a brief reference to Mr. Hunter's and then to Dr. Currie's pamphlet, and proceeds thus:—"Dr. Currie is *sui generis*; spiritually, he is the lineal descendant of John Knox, and inherits his whole estate of prejudices. He is singularly governed in his opinions by party

shibboleths and watchwords. Tell him that truth is Romish, and he would reject it as error. Tell him the proposition that two and two make four is a popish or ritualistic invention, and he would deny the computation and excommunicate the computer. The divinest harmony, the sweetest strains of music that ever fell on angel's ears, if called a mass, would give him symptoms of catalepsy. At all times, and in all places, and under all circumstances, he prefers the screech of the pibroch. That reminds him that he is a Protestant, and recalls the glorious days of the *Solemn League and Covenant*. His mind (we judge from the pages before us) lacks compass and insight. Besides, his pamphlet shows that he has never been an earnest student of the deep mysteries of his faith, and has never trod in the pathway of the Fathers or even of the Reformers. He stands outside of his subject and treats it superficially. Without wit or humor, he is ambitious of saying smart things, and the result is not always in harmony with his endeavors.* He is by no means ingenious, and is very inapt at 'putting things together.'"

Is this what Mr. Hunter and Mr. Flanders call argument?

Now we have not one word to say against the personal characters, the pedigree, or the private history of

* To judge how much better Mr. Flanders succeeds, see his note at the end of his pamphlet.

"NOTE.—We venture to suggest to the younger and more energetic churchmen in the diocese, whether, until they come to their own, and as a means of obtaining peace and quiet meanwhile, it would not be wise to consider the feasibility of carving out of the present Diocese of Pennsylvania a new diocese, the Diocese of Philadelphia, for instance, where they could repose under their own vine and fig tree, with none to molest or make them afraid. There's Dr. Davies and Dr. Foggo! What a fine Prelatical Presence they have to be sure! Which shall it be? OUR LADY shall rain influence and adjudge the prize."

the clergymen of St. Clement's Church. So far as we know or believe, they are earnest and devout men, laboring conscientiously and diligently to promote the spiritual welfare of their fellow-men in the way which they believe to be best and most in accordance with the teaching of the Catholic Church (which, we are bound to add, we also believe of many Presbyterian clergymen and Roman Catholic priests), and, if we believed otherwise, we should not think it becoming to ourselves or befitting the sacredness of the subject, to mix up personal invectives, innuendoes, and sneers with the discussion of the true doctrine of the blessed Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. But we cannot refrain from expressing our wonder—a wonder which we share with many others—that such men should choose to retain their connection with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Pennsylvania, if they believe, with Mr. Flanders, that Pennsylvania Protestant Episcopalianism is not the religion of the Bible and Prayer-Book. But, perhaps, they hope to convert the Church to the true religion.

With Mr. Flanders himself we have no personal acquaintance, but we have supposed him to be an excellent, amiable, and high-minded gentleman. We have no desire now to change our mind, and we think that, on reflection, he will regret the personalities in which he has been led to indulge, not only in the paragraph above quoted but yet more grossly in some other places. And, if so, we venture to suggest that he should not content himself with merely making his confession to "Father Prescott" and receiving his absolution. We speak seriously. An open and frank apology would be more honorable to him as a gentleman,

and a better means of peace to his mind as a Christian, than all the absolutions of all the priests in Christendom,—without it.

But he goes on to say: “We shall endeavor in the following pages, with such aid as we have been able to obtain in the examination of authorities, to give Dr. Currie, in two particulars at least, a clear view of the doctrines and teachings of that Church, the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, in which he ministers; of that Church which, however unhappily divided in its organization, traces its titles back to apostles and martyrs, which unites the past and the present, and takes hold on the future; of that Church which is divinely commissioned to speak with authority; that everywhere, whether under the dismal skies of Scotland or the burning suns of India, has within its spiritual treasury that which appeals to and satisfies the whole nature of man; of that Church which, if he remains in its communion and listens to its voice, will give him peace in this world, and by its sacraments an assurance of peace in the world to come.*

“The first question is, whether in the Communion Service, or in the Consecration and administration of the Sacrament, there is involved a Sacrifice, and secondly, whether our Lord is really present in the Elements? In other words, whether the Communion Service is merely a formal memorial repast, in which a

* Mr. Flanders, in a note, has found out that “Barlow was an unredeemed renegade.” It may be so. Meanwhile he was the consecrator of Archbishop Parker; and the English Church, with our own, receives its orders through him. “It is an ill bird that fouls its own nest.” Dr. Littledale and his ritualistic coadjutors have found out that Cranmer and his fellow-martyrs were no better; and it would not be surprising if Mr. Flanders, upon further acquaintance with those sturdy Protestant reformers, should be ready, in his heart, to coincide with his English friends.

conscious rector is conspicuously *present*, and our Lord conspicuously *absent*, or whether there is in that service of praise and thanksgiving, a Priest, a Sacrifice, and a Real Presence."

Here is a statement of the first question, and of the authority to which the appeal is to be made for its decision. Mr. Hunter had undertaken the more humble task of inquiring "What is the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States" on the question.

But Mr. Flanders seems to hold Protestant Episcopalianism and its doctrine very cheap. He has a grander mission. He proposes to instruct us (or "Dr. Currie") as to "the doctrines and teachings of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church," which—it is presumed—is, in his view, to include the Church in the Middle Ages as well as the Greek and Roman communions of the present day. Or has he some definition which will leave them out? And, if they are not left out, is not the Roman Church, with its doctrine of transubstantiation, the largest and most compact body in this Holy Catholic Apostolic Church? And does she not claim to teach with authority? Has Mr. Flanders considered the grandeur of the assumption, to act as the spokesman and representative of a body so vast and variant? He has not appealed to either of the Catholic creeds. Those creeds are the undoubted doctrine of the Catholic Church, and our Protestant Episcopal Church thoroughly receives and believes them, "because they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." But where has this Holy Catholic Apostolic Church ever recognized as the proper organ of its teaching any ancient liturgy, or any of the old Fathers, or of their new interpreters?

But the true question is, as stated by Mr. Hunter (and from it we are not to be diverted), "What is the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States?" It is to her doctrines that all her ministers and all her churches and congregations promise conformity, and not to what any man, whether clergyman or layman, may set out as the doctrine of the "Holy Catholic Apostolic Church." But you say, "she professes to hold the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church." Certainly she does, in some sense.* She holds that her doctrine is the true doctrine of that Church; but she does not promise to accept as her doctrine whatever you may think you can prove to be the doctrine of the Catholic Church. It is she that is to tell you what is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, not you that are to tell her. She holds also, and distinctly professes to hold, the doctrine of Holy Scripture; and yet would it not be sheer impertinence for you to prove to your own satisfaction your doctrine from Holy Scripture, and forthwith to foist it upon her, and call that conformity to her doctrine? Those are not loyal sons of the Protestant Episcopal Church who, instead of sitting as learners at her feet, presume to dictate to her what she ought to believe, whether from "the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church" or from Holy Scripture; though the latter would, on her own fundamental principles, have far the better right.

We insist upon adhering to Mr. Hunter's original position: "What is the doctrine of the Protestant

* And yet we might demand where she says so. She has declared that the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church has erred in all its principal and primitive branches, in all three of the great primitive patriarchates; and that even its General Councils may err, yea, "in things pertaining to God." (Articles 19 and 21.)

Episcopal Church in the United States" in reference to the questions at issue?

As to the first question, that in regard to the Lord's Supper, it is stated tolerably well in the first part of the paragraph last quoted. But taking the other statements of the pamphlet in connection with the foregoing,* the question, we think, may be fairly stated in a threefold form, thus: (1) In the Communion Service does the Priest sacrifice the very body and blood of Christ? (2) Are the very body and blood of Christ really and properly—no matter how "supernaturally"—present in the elements on the altar? and (3) Is Christ to be adored as being thus present there on the altar? To this we answer, unhesitatingly, no; and appeal to the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church. But in connection with the last paragraph above cited, we have to note, in passing, what we observe is characteristic of both the pamphlets on the other side, and what, there is too much reason to think, indicates the settled state of mind of those whose views these pamphlets represent, viz., the assumption—the gross and groundless, not to say uncharitable assumption—that whoever does not go to their extreme goes of course to the opposite extreme, empties the sacrament of all significance and efficacy, and makes of the Communion Service merely a formal and memorial repast,—the exhibition of a "rector" and not the showing forth of the Lord's death. We can not allow such an assumption to pass unrebuked. Let them know that there are men who, with unutter-

* See the confession of the Clementine Fathers in the "Advertisement": "The Bread and Wine *become* verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ," which are really "present on the altar"; and page 4: "The Eucharist is a real and true sacrifice, in which the Body and Blood of Christ are continually offered to God." &c., &c.

able thankfulness, find as much of Christ in the holy sacrament as they can, and who yet shrink with horror from their Super-Roman materialism. We believe that we revere and love and prize, as much as they, the blessed sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, as it is set forth in the communion office, and in the Catechism and Articles of our Church. We would not abate one jot or tittle from the strongest expression there used for the fullness and the preciousness of its heavenly meaning and the reality of its unspeakable benefits.

“THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE SACRIFICE.”

We first deny that the Christian minister is a sacrificing priest. He is never called *ἱερεύς* or priest in the New Testament; nor is he so received by the Protestant Episcopal Church. Our Church uses the name “priest,” it is true, but only in its etymological sense of presbyter (*i. e.*, elder) with which word, in her constitution and canons she employs it interchangeably; and which word was substituted for “priest” in the Scottish Prayer-Book throughout, and that under the immediate supervision of Archbishop Laud. The venerable Bishop White says: “It is well known that the English Reformers took care to show that they did not mean to identify the names of the Christian ministry with those of the Jewish priesthood; although they retained the name of ‘priest,’ which is *πρεσβύτερος* or presbyter) with an English termination, and in the Roman Catholic Church had stood alike for that Greek word and for *ἱερεύς*.” (Mem., pages 177–8.) And he vehemently protests against “obtruding on the Church the notions of ‘sacrifice,’ in the strict and

proper sense; of 'altar' as the place of it, and of 'priest' as the sacrificer."*

But is the Lord's Supper a real and true sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, according to the doctrine of this Church? In denying this, we do not deny that there are sacrifices, in the modified sense, connected with the celebration of the Supper; (1) of our alms and oblations, (2) of the holy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, (3) of praise and thanksgiving (that is, "the fruit of our lips," as the apostle says), and (4) of ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice—an unbloody sacrifice. But we do deny that there is "a real, proper, and true sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ." To prove that there is, Mr. Flanders cites the Liturgies of "St. Mark," of "St. James, Apostle," &c., &c. Here, of course, we are leaving the doctrine of our Church, to learn from Mr. Flanders "what are the doctrines and teachings of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church." But let us follow him. In the first place, it may be well for his unsophisticated readers to understand that there is not the slightest evidence that "St. Mark" or "St. James, Apostle," or any other apostle or any other saint known in our calendar, had anything whatever to do with the composition of any of these liturgies. In the second place, it is not certain that they were any of them composed by any one hand, but they are probably the accretions of many generations, and what parts are ancient or modern,

* The terminology of the office of Institution is exceptional, and at war with that of all the rest of the Prayer-Book, and of the English Church ever since the Reformation. The words "altar" and "sacerdotal" must be supposed to be there used in a figurative sense, as every man performs *sacerdotal* functions at the family *altar*. Besides, the use of that office is not required but merely permitted: "The Bishop *may* transmit," &c.

or what parts are genuine or interpolated, it might be difficult to show, although the best critics are of opinion that precisely those parts most favorable to Mr. Flanders's views are of later growth. Bishop Jewel tells Harding (who also appealed to these ancient liturgies) that "St. James's liturgy hath a special prayer for them who live in monasteries, and yet it was rathe [early] to have monasteries built in all St. James's time"; and that St. Chrysostom's liturgy—another of the "forty"—"prayeth for Pope Nicholas, who lived in the year of our Lord 857." The Greek liturgy of St. Mark contains a prayer for "the orthodox emperor." When Mr. Flanders has well ascertained the authenticity of these liturgies and the genuineness of their several parts, let him allege them;* and then we will show that, after all, neither they nor the Fathers whom he afterwards cites make much for his purpose, for it will appear from Augustine and other Fathers that their highly rhetorical language may and should be interpreted in a figurative sense.

* To the inquiry why none of the ancient liturgies are now remaining as they were first composed for the use of particular churches, Bingham answers:—(1.) Because every bishop had liberty to frame his own liturgy. (2.) Those liturgies were probably recited *memoriter*, and not set down in the books; for, in the persecution under Diocletian (Cir., A. D. 300), we read of no such books ever having been delivered up by the *traditores* to be burnt, as they certainly would have been had they existed. (3.) If any were compiled into books, they have been mostly lost or reduced to fragments by the injuries of time. (4.) Because of interpolations and additions made to those ancient liturgies in subsequent ages, "For," he adds, "though those which go under the name of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil might originally have some of their composition in them, yet, so many additions and alterations have been made in them by the Greek Church in following ages [and as for those of "St. Mark" and "St. James, Apostle," he does not think it necessary so much as to mention them in connection with a question of genuineness], that it is not easy to discern, after they have passed through so many hands, and so much new modeling, what was the genuine composition of the first authors, and therefore I have made little use of them in this work." Orig. Eccles., B., xiii. c. v.

Mr. Flanders challenges Dr. Currie "to quote a single early Christian writer who denies that the Eucharist is a real, true, and proper sacrifice." What if they had no occasion to deny it? What if nobody thought of believing it? Have they denied that it is the true and proper new-moon?—But let us see.

Eusebius says: "He gave us a remembrance instead of a sacrifice, to offer up continually unto God." Dem. Evang., 1, 10, 38.

He calls our prayer "a pure sacrifice." 1, 6, 19.

And again he says: "We burn the incense of prayer, and we offer up the sacrifice that is called pure, not by shedding of blood but by pure actions." *Ibid.*

And yet again: "They shall offer unto him reasonable and unbloody sacrifices," which he expounds upon the spot, "the sacrifice of praise." 1, 10.

Iræneus says: "The Church offereth up to God [not the body and blood of Christ, but] a natural thing of God's creation; neither is our altar here in earth, but in heaven; thither our prayers and oblations are directed." Lib. iv., ch. 34.

Chrysostom says: "The sacrifice of the Gospel ascendeth up without blood, without smoke, without altar, and other like." V. 115.

Jerome says: "Every holy man hath within himself the altar of God, which is faith." In Ps. 26.

Augustine says: "Christ hath given us to celebrate in his Church an image or token of that sacrifice for a remembrance of his passion." Tom. vi., col. 34.

"The flesh and blood of this sacrifice before the coming of Christ was promised by sacrifices of resemblance; the same was performed *indeed* in the time of Christ's passion; but after Christ's ascension it is

frequented by a sacrament of remembrance." VIII., col., 348.

And, again, more plainly: "This visible sacrifice is a sacrament—*i. e.*, a token or sign—of the sacrifice invisible." "The thing which we call a sacrifice is a sign and representation of a sacrifice." VII., 241.

So Dionysius Areopagita calls it *Συμβολικὴν . . . εἰδουργίαν*—a figurative sacrifice.

Augustine says: "The sacrifice of our Lord's passion every man then offereth for himself when he is confirmed in the faith of his passion." "Then is the sacrifice of our Lord in a manner offered for each man when in baptism he is marked with the name of Christ." III., ii. 93.

"Thus many ways St. Augustine himself teacheth us what he meant by this term 'sacrifice,' an oblation of praise, a similitude, a resemblance, a likeness, an image, a remembrance, a token, a sign, a representation, of a sacrifice. So Nazianzen calleth it 'the figure or token of the great mystery.' To conclude, St. Jerome saith thus: 'Then shalt thou receive sacrifice, either when thou offerest thyself (upon the cross) for us to the Father or when thou receivest of us praises and thanksgivings.' St. Cyprian saith: 'All that of Christ be called Christians offer to God the daily sacrifice, being ordained by God priests of holiness.' . . . St. Augustine saith: 'Every man offereth up the sacrifice of our Lord's passion for his own sins;' and St. Chrysostom saith: 'In the holy mysteries the priest differeth not from the people.' . . . It appeareth by these ancient learned fathers that every Christian man is bound to offer up the unbloody and daily sacrifice of the New Testament,

and that in as full and ample sort as is the priest." Jewel's Works, ii., 737.

"Like as Jerome saith: 'Christ that was born of the virgin is born unto us every day,' 'Christ unto us is daily crucified;' and so Augustine saith: 'Then is Christ presently slain to every man when he trusteth wholly in his death and believeth that he was slain;' and as the same St. Augustine saith: 'Christ riseth again unto thee every day;' and as Chrysostom saith: 'In the holy mysteries is wrought and perfected the death of Christ;' briefly, as Gregory saith: 'Christ is slain in the mystery and dieth again;' even so, and in the same sense and meaning and none otherwise, Œcumenius [whom Harding had alleged] saith: 'Christ is offered in the holy supper.' But as Christ is neither daily born of the virgin, nor daily crucified, nor daily slain, nor daily riseth from the dead, nor daily suffereth, nor daily dieth, but only in a certain manner of speech, not verily and indeed; even so Christ is daily sacrificed only in a certain manner of speech and in a mystery, but really, verily, and indeed he is not sacrificed." Jewel, ii., 733.

"What then meaneth Mr. Harding, to tell us, and to bear the world in hand, that contrariwise he hath authority to offer up Christ? . . . O Mr. Harding, God open the eyes of your heart that you may see the miserable nakedness of your side; Deceive not yourself. Mock not the world. Consider better of your authorities. Of all the holy learned fathers, of whom you tell us you have such store, ye are not yet able to show us one, either Greek or Latin, or heretic or catholic, from the rising of the

sun to the sun going down, that ever said as you say : 'a mortal man hath authority and power to offer up in sacrifice the Son of God.'" Jewel, II., 738.

And yet Mr. Flanders has the hardihood to remind us of the name of Jewel :—and of Cranmer, too, who, in his fifth book on the Sacrament of the oblation and sacrifice of Christ, utterly denies that there is any other sacrifice possible to minister or layman but that of ourselves, "our lauds and our praises," and adds, "All such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors, in making a sacrifice of him, they be his most heinous and horrible adversaries." Works, I., 364.

Hooker thinks "the word *presbyter* doth seem more fit and in propriety of speech more agreeable than *priest*, with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ." Yet he would not be squeamish about the use of a word, and would not be offended with *priest*, if the word be used "as the Fathers used it," in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionable (analogous) to ancient sacrifices, namely, the communion of the blessed body and blood of Christ; although it have *properly now no sacrifice*.

Mr. Flanders challenges Dr. Currie "to quote a single early Christian writer who denies that the Eucharist is a real, true, and proper sacrifice" "of the very body and blood of Christ," "that the holy table of the Lord is an altar, and that the minister of Christ is a sacrificing priest." Mr. Flanders can now judge of the profoundness of his theological and ecclesiastical lore, and may see whether it was well to reckon without his host. He can determine whether he finds himself more at home with the Romish Harding or

the Protestant Bishop Jewel. In addition to the citations from the early fathers above given, there is the testimony of the judicious Hooker, a man who has the repute of no mean patristic learning,—nearly equal, perhaps, to Mr. Flanders himself; of Bishop Jewel, who had, at least, some smattering of the “early Christian writers,” and of Archbishop Cranmer himself, who is claimed as the author of those very parts of our communion office which are alleged to teach the *sacrifice*. Were these men “in earnest and complete ignorance” of all antiquity? Were they “Pennsylvania Protestant Episcopalians?” Or do they admit that the “Eucharist is a real, true, and proper sacrifice of the very body and blood of Christ?”

Mr. Flanders quietly assumes that, by “the holy gifts which we now offer unto thee,” in our liturgy, is meant the very body and blood of Christ, which the elements have already “become” by the words of consecration; although the liturgy itself immediately afterwards calls them expressly “these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine.” From which it appears that they remain bread and wine not only after the consecration but after the oblation, and even in the invocation we do not pray that they may be made, or may “become,” the very body and blood of Christ, but that “we *receiving* them in remembrance of Christ’s death and passion” (as he appointed in his institution), “may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.” The sacrament is an *outward sign*; the *res sacramenti* is an *inward grace*. And below the priest says: “here we offer and present ourselves;”* from

* The verbal criticism of Mr. Flanders is sometimes remarkable. “The holy gifts which we offer”—he says, “which we sacrifice”—we should say, “which we present.” When we say, “here we offer and present ourselves,” do we

which it appears that throughout the service the "we" implies that the priest is but the spokesman of the whole body of the communicants, and no more a sacrificing priest than any one of them.

As for Bishop Seabury's testimony as cited, with one exception, it is easily interpreted in consistency with our views, and is quite inconsistent with those of Mr. Flanders. He calls it "a *commemorative* sacrifice;" "the Christian sacrifice of bread and wine," not of the very body and blood of Christ, "a true and proper sacrifice *commemorative*, i. e., a memorial made before God to put him in mind; that is, *to plead with him the meritorious sacrifice and death of his dear Son.*"* And so is every Christian sacrifice of prayer.

mean, "here we sacrifice and present ourselves?" The simple fact is that the *verb* "sacrifice" is not good English in such a connection. Again, in the phrase, "this our bounden duty and service," he strangely interpolates "sacrifice." Indeed, he seems determined to have "sacrifice" in the liturgy, at all hazards,—the rules of grammar, logic, and the English language to the contrary notwithstanding.

* They say the Eucharist is something more than a "memorial." And, when we ask them what it is more, they say, it is also a sacrifice. And, when we ask how they show that, they say, "Why, a memorial *is* a sacrifice," and quote Leviticus, Numbers, and the Greek *μνημόσυνον* (see Mr. Hunter). That is to say, "putting things together," a memorial is something more than a memorial. And yet this is a pet argument on that side. The truth is, a sacrifice may be a memorial, but it does not follow that a memorial is a sacrifice. This word *μνημόσυνον* is not the word used for "remembrance" in the Supper; and it is remarkable that, in two of the cases in which it *is* used in the New Testament, it cannot be supposed to mean sacrifice in any sense,—“This that this woman hath done shall be told for a memorial, *μνημόσυνον*, of her.” In the only other case in which it is used, it refers to the prayers and alms of Cornelius, which, we presume, will not be held to have been “a real, true, and proper sacrifice.” As for the word *αναμνήσις* remembrance, which *is* used in the Supper, there is no argument to be drawn from the Greek word to show that it implies a sacrifice which is not equally cogent from the English word; so that mere English readers can judge of its force as well as Grecians, and it is simply throwing dust into men's eyes to pretend that there is anything specially technical or recondite in the Greek word.

We said, "with one exception." We here refer to the following citation from Bishop Seabury:—"It being admitted that Christ did offer himself—his natural body and blood—his whole humanity to God, a sacrifice for the sins of the world; and having been shown that he *did not offer himself on the cross*, but was, in everything that related to his crucifixion, *merely* passive; it may be asked, When did he offer himself? Answer, In the institution of the Holy Eucharist."

This is indeed astounding language; and we simply set against it these plain words from the liturgy itself: "The most comfortable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, to be received in remembrance of his meritorious cross and passion, *whereby alone** we obtain remission of our sins and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven;" and these: "All glory be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made *there* (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."† We suppose there can be no doubt which is the doctrine of our Church.

* Some persons, who profess to know more than their neighbors about "the teachings and doctrines of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church," are said to read and interpret this "*whereby alone*" as referring back to "the most comfortable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ;" in blissful ignorance that thus they deny the remission of sins in baptism.—A drowning man will catch at a straw.

† We may here add, in passing, that Bishop Seabury is a very "unlucky witness" for Mr. Flanders in reference to his Clementine doctrine of the Supper. It would seem impossible that he could have referred to him if he had ever read his whole discourse "Of the Holy Eucharist." He there, after rejecting the Popish, the Lutheran, and what he describes as, the Calvinistic doctrine, says:

We conclude what we have to say of the priest and the sacrifice, with the following from Bishop White:—"If, indeed, they could have been *reasonably thought*" (*i. e.*, the forms introduced into the communion service by Bishop Seabury) "to imply that a Christian minister is a priest, in the sense of an offerer of sacrifice, and that the table is an altar, and the elements a sacrifice in any other than figurative senses, he (*i. e.*, Bishop White) would have zealously opposed the admission of such unevangelical sentiments, as he conceives them to be. The English Reformers carefully exploded everything of this sort at the time of their issuing *the first* book of common prayer, which contained the oblation and the invocation. Although they were left out in a subsequent review, yet it is known to have been done at the instance of two learned foreigners, and in order to avoid what was thought to be the appearance of encouragement of the superstition, which had been done away." Mem., page 154.

Is Bishop White, perchance, to be classed as one who is "in earnest and complete ignorance of the past," one "that *don't* reason, that don't reflect, don't

"The natural body and blood of Christ are in heaven, in glory and exaltation; we receive them not in the communion in any sense. The bread and wine are his body and blood *sacramentally and by representation*." Here it is clear Bishop Seabury includes under "natural body" the idea of the glorified spiritual body. This natural or spiritual, this true, proper, and literal body of Christ, * Bishop Seabury declares we do not receive in the communion "in any sense," whether natural or "supernatural." He not only denies that the consecrated bread has "become" that body, so that it is really present objectively on the holy table before reception; but, in his horror of what he has represented as Calvin's idea, he denies that we *receive* that body "in any sense." This would seem to be pure Zwinglianism. He has evidently misconstrued Calvin's teaching, which is that of a real *spiritual* presence in the soul of the believing *recipient*, and which, as will abundantly appear further on, is the very doctrine of our Church, and was undoubtedly the doctrine of Bishop Seabury himself.

put things together"? No wonder Mr. Flanders, with his Clementine views, has a horror of "Pennsylvania Protestant Episcopalianism."*

* It is worthy of especial note, that in the prayer-book of 1549 the "invocation" comes *before* the "institution," and is in the following words:—"Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee, and with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ: who in the same night," &c. *After* the institution is added (not the oblation but) the "memorial," "we celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial," &c. Here, the "invocation" and "institution" having preceded "these thy holy gifts" might be supposed (by such as the Clementine Fathers) to have "become" verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ; but, even so, *they are not offered*,—the words, "which we now offer unto thee," are not found there. In the Scottish (Laudean) prayer-book, the "invocation" still comes *before* the "institution," and has a significant *addition* to that of 1549, in the following words:—"So that we receiving them according to thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood: who in the night," &c. *After* the "institution" follows the "memorial or prayer of oblation," but it is in the very same words as that of 1549, and does not, any more than that, contain after "the holy gifts," the phrase "which we now offer unto thee." Now, all this is very significant in relation to the structure of the service in our prayer-book. (1.) Our prayer-book puts the "invocation" *after* both the "institution" and the "oblation," and recognizes the "gifts" as still only "creatures of bread and wine." (2.) In this "invocation" we do not pray (with the book of 1549), "that they may be unto us the body and blood of Christ,"—these words, though themselves not absolute, but containing the restriction "*unto us*" are yet entirely omitted,—but we only pray (with the addition made in the Scottish liturgy) "that we receiving them, &c., may be partakers of that body and blood;" so that there is no *possible* reference to any external change of the elements in themselves before the receiving. (3.) In the memorial or "oblation," after the "holy gifts," we add, "which we now offer unto thee;" but this is now only offering the holy gifts which are *afterwards* called "gifts and creatures of bread and wine," and on which the power of the Holy Ghost and the Divine word is *afterwards* invoked that they may be so sanctified that "we *receiving them*," &c., "may be partakers of Christ's most blessed body and blood." If they had already "become" in very deed and reality Christ's body and blood, what could we mean by praying that in receiving them we might be partakers of his body and blood? What would this be but praying that in receiving them we might receive them? And especially, if it be also true, as Mr. F. says, "the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" teaches, that in the sacrament the wicked receive the body and blood of Christ as well as the faithful,—in fact, that *nobody can receive the consecrated bread and wine without also receiving in them the very body and blood of Christ?*

“THE REAL PRESENCE.”

Here the question is : Is it the doctrine of our Church that, after the words of consecration, the very body and blood of Christ are truly and properly present externally (whether naturally or supernaturally) under the forms of the elements there on the holy table ; and that, whether there be any worthy communicant or not ?

On this Mr. Flanders takes the affirmative. His reasoning from the Bible is curious. “The Bible tells us that Jesus took a piece of bread in his hands and said, ‘this is my body.’ We are bound, then,” says Mr. Flanders, “to take him at his word, or to set him down as a lunatic or a liar.” We take him at his word undoubtedly. But the question is, What do the words mean ? Shall we insist upon so interpreting them as to make him a lunatic or a liar ? or so as to give them a reasonable, a real and solemn significance befitting the momentous occasion ? *

According to him, “The word of God says the bread which we break is the body of Christ, and the cup which we bless is the blood of Christ.” In our Bible—if that is what he means by the word of God—we nowhere find this ; but we find : “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ ? and the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ ?” If there is no difference, why make the change ?

* “But,” they say, “*we* take Christ to mean just what he says : ‘This is my body.’ We need not go to Zwinglius for an answer. Let Nazianzen, one of the old fathers, answer : ‘Like as our Lord Jesus Christ is called the life, the way, the bread, the wine, the true light, and a thousand things else, so is he also called the sword.’” That is to say, as he is the bread, so is he the sword, and not otherwise.

He declares that all early liturgies affirm his doctrine, and that all early writers are in accord with them. He then cites a large number of isolated passages, gives seven or eight references, and offers a dozen of names more. We can not follow them. It would be easy to show how the sense is modified by the connection. We could cite from many if not all of them utterances which show that the inference which Mr. Flanders would have us draw from their language is unfounded. But we have not space for so large a work. We will confine ourselves to one of his authorities—St. Augustine. Him he repeatedly cites, and he adds: "The compilers of the articles quote St. Augustine. Is there any doubt of the latter's views as to the real presence, or that the former intended to sanction and adopt them?"

Augustine says: "Christ received Judas to his banquet, wherein he gave to his disciples the *figure* of his body and blood" (iv. 7), and so in almost innumerable other places. (So also Tertullian: "This is my body *i. e.*, the *figure* of my body." Cont. Marc., iv., 7.)

Again, Augustine says: "The Lord doubted not to say, 'This is my body,' when he gave the sign of his body." VIII., 124.

"A sign," says he, "is a thing that, besides the sight itself which it offereth unto the senses, causeth of itself some other certain thing to come into the thought"—not to exist objectively there present under its own form, but "to come into the thought." III, i., 19. And so to common sense must a sign be. A sign does not produce the objective thing, or transport it from one place to another, or "become" the thing which it sig-

nifies ; it can produce no effect except as addressed to some intelligence—"it causeth something else to come into the mind."

"A sacrament," says Augustine, "is a holy token—*sacrum signum*." And, "in sacraments we must consider not what they *be indeed*, but what they *signify*." VIII., 725.

As Christ is upon the table, so is the faithful people upon the table. St. Augustine says to the people: "*Vos estis in mensa, vos estis in calice*—you are upon the table, you are in the cup." Cit. a Bed. ad. Cor. i. x. And so the apostle, "we being many *are* one bread."

Augustine says: "Whoso holdeth that Christ's body is both in heaven and in earth at one time, utterly dissolveth and destroyeth the nature of Christ's body." II., 681.

And, again, of the sacrament: "It is a *figure*, therefore," ("therefore," he says—he had reasoned it out, and this is his conclusion) *teaching* us that we ought to have fellowship with Christ's sufferings, and to hold in sweet and salutary remembrance that for us his flesh was wounded and crucified," &c. Doct. Christ., iii., 10, 16.

To the question, how can the sponsors in baptism truly answer that an infant believes, St. Augustine replies that the answer may properly be made according to the common usage that a *representation* or *sacrament* of a thing receives the name of the thing itself. "The sacrament of faith *is* faith." And he proceeds: "when Good Friday is near, we say, to-morrow or next day is our Lord's Passion ; on the Lord's day we say, this day our Lord arose. Why is there

nobody so *silly* as to say we lie when we so speak, but for this reason, because we give names to those days from the representation they make to us of those on which the things were done?" Then speaking directly of the Holy Supper, he adds: "was not Christ in his own person offered up once for all? And yet in the sacrament he is offered in the Church not only every Easter but every day, nor does he lie, who, being asked, says he is offered. For, unless sacraments had some likeness of the things whereof they be sacraments, then were there no sacraments? But from this similitude they do very often (*plerumque*) take the names of the very things themselves." Ad. Bonif. Epist., 23.

Thus St. Augustine gives us a brief explanation of the whole matter, and a key for the interpretation of all the speeches not only of himself but of all the old fathers, which are quoted with so much confidence on the other side. "The sacraments take the names of the very things themselves." Now, either Mr. Flanders must admit that his witnesses have contradicted themselves, and then their testimony is broken down; or else he must admit the application of this key,—and it will serve for the ancient liturgies as well,—and then what becomes of his boasted authorities, though culled from somebody's collection by the whole staff of St. Clement's Church? How idle it is for him to quote St. Augustine for their view of the sacrament, to show that the consecrated bread has "become" the very literal body of Christ, when St. Augustine tells him expressly that that is figurative language and has no such meaning, and that, in his time, no person was "so *silly*" as to give to it any such meaning?

St. Augustine also plainly teaches that the participation of the body and blood of Christ depends upon subjective conditions—upon the faith of the recipient of the sacrament.

“Put the words, of God unto the element and it is made a sacrament, not because the word is spoken, but because it is believed ; and this is the word of faith which we preach. III, ii., 703.

“Christ named himself the bread from heaven, exhorting us to believe in him ; for *believing in him is the eating of the bread of life.*” III, ii., 494.

“The sacrament is received of some unto life, of some unto destruction. But the thing itself”—*res sacramenti*, *i. e.*, the body of Christ—“whereof it is a sacrament, is received of *all men unto life*, and of no man unto destruction, whosoever be partaker of it.” III, ii., 500.

So that St. Augustine and “the learned and devout Bishop Forbes,” together with his very learned friend, Mr. Flanders,—who is to “tell us what are the teachings and doctrines of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church,”—are directly pitted against each other.* Our liturgy is evidently on the side of Augustine. Mr. Flanders, having quoted the twenty-ninth article of religion :

* Mr. Flanders confirms his position, that Christ's presence does not depend upon the subjective condition, the faith, of the recipient, by a citation from Bishop Forbes: “The *res sacramenti* is received by the wicked.” But the body of Christ is the *res sacramenti* (see catechism). And the article declares that “the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.” Mr. Flanders says, with Bishop Forbes, it is received and eaten by the wicked, irrespective of their spiritual condition ; *i. e.*, without faith, *i. e.*, without means, *by no means*,—somehow, if we could only tell how without a contradiction ; in short, that we may seem to say something, let us say, “supernaturally.” Mr. Flanders had better be shy of “the learned and devout Bishop Forbes” the next time.

“the wicked press with their teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ,” adds: “the sacrament is there, the beneficial effect is wanting;” *i. e.*, he holds that “partaking of Christ,” of his body and blood (which is what the article denies to the wicked) is “receiving the beneficial effects of the sacrament,”—the *res sacramenti* is “the beneficial effects.” That, surely, is making the real presence *subjective* with a vengeance. One would hardly have expected Mr. Flanders to come out a full-blown Zwinglian, after all. And moreover, on the external, objective theory, how would it be, if, instead of a wicked man, a mouse, *e. g.*, were to eat a crumb of the consecrated bread? Would he eat the entire body of Christ, and, with it, his whole humanity and divinity, only not receiving “any beneficial effects?”

Not only, according to Augustine, may one receive the sacrament without partaking of the body and blood of Christ; but he may really and truly partake of the body and blood of Christ without receiving the sacrament of that body and blood. “No man may in any wise doubt but that every faithful man is then made partaker of the body and blood of Christ, when, in baptism, he is made a member of Christ; and that he is not without the fellowship of that bread and of that cup, although, before he eat of that bread and drink of that cup, he depart this world, being in the unity of Christ’s body. For he is not made frustrate of the communion and benefit of that sacrament, while he findeth that *thing* which by the *sacrament* is *signified*.” Cit. Bed., 1 Cor. x.

“It might have pleased Mr. Harding,” says Jewel, “to take the advice of Bede, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and other godly fathers, he should soon have found that the faithful may otherwise eat Christ’s body and that *verily and indeed*, and not only in the sacrament.”

“As certainly as Christ gave his body upon the cross, so certainly he giveth now the self-same body unto the faithful, and that not only in the ministration of the sacrament, as Mr. Harding untruly imagineth, but also at all times whensoever we be able to say with St. Paul, ‘I think I know nothing but Jesus Christ and the same Christ crucified upon the cross.’ Therefore, St. Ambrose writeth thus: ‘O thou Jew, what desirest thou? That Christ should give thee bread? He giveth it to all men, he giveth it daily, he giveth it at all times.’” Jewel, 1, 449-50.

Moreover, this is the express doctrine of our Church, which says that, under certain circumstances, if a sick person “do truly repent him of his sins and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ both suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, *he doth eat and drink the body and blood* of our Saviour Christ, profitably to his soul’s health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth.” So that no real, objective, external presence is necessary to the real inward and spiritual eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ; and it does not follow, as they seem to suppose, that whoever believes in this real, inward, and spiritual eating and drinking of the very body and blood of Christ, must of course believe in

their real, objective, external presence under the forms of the elements, irrespective and independent of the faith of the recipient. And it is to be observed, the sick man is to think directly of Christ and of his sacrifice upon the cross ; and not a word is said of his thinking of the Sacrament, or of any other priest perchance offering a sacrifice anywhere else.

And so, again, the twenty-eighth article declares : "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, *ONLY* after a heavenly and spiritual manner." Yes, no doubt the *res sacramenti*, the very body of Christ, is given, taken, and eaten by the faithful in the Supper ; but it is given by Christ himself to the believing soul, not by the hand of the priest, for it is given *only* after a heavenly and spiritual manner ; it is taken into the heart by faith, not into the hand ; it is eaten in the heart, not in the mouth ; it nourishes the soul, not the body ; for it is taken and eaten *only* after a heavenly and spiritual manner,—we feed on him in our hearts by faith ;—"In the heart, not in the hand," as Keble wrote in his first inspiration, and not, as he afterwards perverted it, "In the heart *and* in the hand,"—for it is *only* after a heavenly and spiritual manner.

So Hooker plainly says, as already cited by Dr. Currie, "The real presence of Christ's most sacred body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament." Here the case is stated both negatively and positively. The sense is clear, unequivocal, inevitable. Either Hooker must be wrong or the Clementine Fathers are wrong.

It is amusing to see Laud quietly put among the English Reformers and Martyrs. "Is Saul also among

the prophets?" Laud is quoted as saying that "a greater reverence (no doubt) is due to the body than to the word of our Lord." St. Augustine seems to have thought otherwise, for he says: "If ye will answer truly ye must say that the word of Christ is no less a thing than the body of Christ. Therefore, look with what diligence ye take heed when the body of Christ is ministered unto you that no part thereof fall to the ground, even so take heed that the word of God be not lost from a pure heart."* V., Append., 504.

But Mr. Flanders ventures to cite two who *were* English Reformers and Martyrs—Cranmer and Ridley. He introduces them with a notable preface. "Of course," says he to Dr. Currie, in his usual magisterial tone, "the opinions of the English Reformers *cannot* be gathered from one or two extracts characteristic of the writers or otherwise, nor from any gloss or commentary which Dr. Currie may put on the 'expressions of opinion' of one, or two, or half a dozen of them 'on cognate subjects.' Their writings must be examined and they must speak for themselves."

Yet, as a curious illustration of the principle he had just laid down, he proceeds to say: "Cranmer's real belief on the subject of the Eucharist is embodied in the following extract" (and as this is the only extract he has found it necessary or convenient to make from Cranmer, it seems his rule is only for Dr. Currie and not for Mr. Flanders): "In 1548, while he (Cranmer) was engaged in compiling the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., he translated a catechism from Jonas, the

* So much for Laud. The citation above referred to is the only one Mr. Flanders has taken from Laud, and we leave him and St. Augustine to settle the question together.

orthodoxy of which he maintained to the last. In this he says: 'When Christ taketh bread and saith, This is my body, we ought not to doubt that we eat his very body; and when he taketh the cup and saith, This is my blood, we ought to think assuredly that we drink his very blood.'" Be it so; but observe Cranmer does not say that the bread and wine "become" the very body and blood of Christ, or that the very body and blood of Christ are there on the table; but *we eat and drink* (spiritually and in our souls, no doubt) the very body and blood.

Mr. Flanders is scandalized at Dr. Currie's "putting contempt upon the fathers by calling their affirmations rhetoric," and would make much of the point that "when Cranmer had to do with the prayer of Consecration in our liturgy, he did not know Bucer, or Œcolampadius, or Zwingli."

Let Cranmer "speak for himself." Of the Romish Gardiner and his side, he says: "*They say*, that after such sort as Christ is in the sacrament and there eaten, so good men eat his body and blood only when they receive the sacrament. *We say*, that as they eat and drink Christ in the sacrament, so do they eat, drink, and feed on him continually so long as they be members of his body." Works, I., 70. Gardiner retorted that Cranmer was inconsistent with himself, having set forth a different doctrine in the liturgy, and in the catechism of Jonas, which he had translated from the German. As to the liturgy, Cranmer replies: "In the book of the holy communion, we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made [or "*become*"] the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us*

* Unto us who receive them, *i. e.*, "subjectively," and, as Hooker says, "instrumentally."

in that holy mystery they may be so—that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be nourished." Page 79. As to the catechism, he replies, and let his reply be especially noted: "In a catechism by me translated and set forth, I used like manner of speech, saying that with our bodily mouths we receive the body and blood of Christ. Which my saying divers ignorant persons, not used to read old ancient authors, nor acquainted with their phrase and manner of speech, did carp and reprehend for lack of good understanding. For this speech . . . and all other like be not understood of the very flesh and blood of Christ, which in very deed we neither feel nor see, but that which we do to the bread and wine, by a figurative speech, is spoken to be done to the flesh and blood, because they be the very signs, figures, and tokens instituted by Christ to represent unto us his very flesh and blood." Page 226.

Thus Cranmer had the same key that Augustine used. Who now is "putting contempt upon the fathers"? And what becomes now of the "German influence"? Will Mr. Flanders take Cranmer's own interpretation of his own words? So far from such an interpretation "putting contempt upon the fathers" or upon him, it is the only way of saving them from contempt.

But hear Cranmer again: "Although Christ in his human nature substantially, really, corporeally, naturally, and sensibly be present with his Father in heaven, yet, sacramentally and spiritually, he is here present. For in the *water*, bread, and wine, he is present as in

signs and sacraments, but he is *indeed spiritually* in those faithful Christian people, which, according to Christ's ordinance, *be baptized, or receive the holy communion, or unfeignedly believe in him.*" I., page 47.

"Yes," says Mr. Flanders, "that is just what we all believe, that the body and blood of Christ are *sacramentally present*, that is all, and that is what Cranmer says." But that will not do. Cranmer says: "he is present as *in signs*": he calls sacraments "signs," or, with Augustine, *verba visibilia*—words addressed to the eye; but *indeed and spiritually* he is present (not in the signs, but) in the Christian people. The clergy of St. Clement's teach that "the bread and wine become verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ. . . . present on the altar." If what Cranmer says of a *sacramental presence* will bear that construction, then he says also that the water in baptism "becomes verily and indeed the body of Christ present" in the font. Besides, he expressly contrasts the being present *indeed spiritually* with the being present sacramentally, or by signs; and says that the former presence—the real, the spiritual presence—is had not only by those who receive the holy communion, but by all who unfeignedly believe in Christ.

Gardiner had maintained that it might be said Christ is corporeally present in the sacrament, but not after a corporeal but a spiritual manner. To this Cranmer replies: "I say that Christ is spiritually and by grace in his Supper *as he is* when two or three be gathered together in his name; meaning that with both he is spiritually and with neither corporeally." Page 92. Again: "While in the word and baptism we are made partakers of Christ spiritually; in the Eucharist, we

be made participant of his Godhead by his humanity exhibited to us for food. . . . The manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament is spiritual and supernatural. . . . And we, armed by his word, know only the truth to be so that it is there indeed . . . his natural body . . . as for the manner of the presence, that is only spiritual." Does or does not Mr. Flanders subscribe to that? It seems to us he might very reasonably suppose that he was listening to the very words of the Clementine Fathers, and be ready to rejoice at having them confirmed by so good an authority as Archbishop Cranmer. But they are the words of his Romish adversary, Gardiner; and to them Cranmer replies: "You go about to put a diversity in the exhibition of Christ, . . . but Christ *in one sort* is *exhibited* in all these three, in his word, in baptism, and in the Lord's Supper—that is to say, spiritually." Page 155.

Again Cranmer says: "When I use to speak sometimes (as the old authors do) that Christ is in the sacraments, I mean the same as they did understand, . . . his sacramental presence. And sometimes I mean the *whole ministration* and *receiving* of the sacraments, . . . meaning that in the due administration . . . Christ *and his Holy Spirit* be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power *in all them that worthily receive the same.*" Page 3.

"You gather of my saying unjustly that Christ is indeed absent; for I say, according to God's word and the doctrine of the old writers, that Christ is present in his sacraments, as they teach also that he is present in his word when he worketh mightily by the same in

the hearts of the hearers. By which manner of speech is not meant that Christ is corporeally present in the voice or sound of the speaker, but that he worketh with his word, using the voice of the speaker as his instrument . . . as he useth also his sacraments, and therefore is said to be present in them."

Page 11. "The presence is all one, the clothing all one, and the feeding all one, although the one *for the more comfort and consolation* have the sacrament added to it, and the other be without the sacrament." Page 77.

And yet the old martyr Cranmer is quoted in proof of this new-fangled Clementine doctrine of the real presence under the forms of bread and wine on the altar! Had he anticipated that this would be the result of his teaching he might have spared his offending right hand.

Ridley was perfectly agreed with Cranmer. To the charge that the Protestants made nothing of the Lord's Supper by their figurative interpretation, he replies: "I assure you I make no less of the sacrament than this, I say whosoever receiveth the sacrament, he receiveth therewith life or death"; and, when he was told that, unless Christ were corporeally there, it were absurd so to speak, he answers: "Sir, when you hear God's word truly preached, if you do believe it and abide in it ye shall and do receive life withal, and if you do not believe, it doth bring unto you death." Works, page 161.

Ridley it was who was so zealous in substituting an "honest table" for the old Romish altar. And when his opponents objected that the prayer-book then in use (the first of Edward VI.) recognized altars, he

replied: "It calls the thing whereupon the Lord's Supper is ministered indifferently a table, an altar, and the Lord's board." So much for the mere *name*; for the *thing* he adds: "The *form* of a table shall ever swerve the simple from the superstitious opinions of the popish mass unto the right use of the Lord's Supper. *For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it; the use of a table is to serve for men to eat upon.*" Page 32.

Ridley is a very "unlucky witness" for Mr. Flanders. He seems almost to have anticipated, in order to contradict, this modern ritualistic monstrosity. At the very beginning of his treatise on the Lord's Supper he says: "If the matter of the sacrament is not bread then we *must* needs grant transubstantiation, *seeing that* all learned men in England, so far as I know, both new and old, grant there is but *one* substance." The bread has not "become" another body, itself remaining unchanged the same, so that it is both bodies or substances at once; an absurdity which the learned men in England at that time, both old and new, had never so much as thought of. "If it is found," he adds, "that the substance of bread is the natural substance of the sacrament, although for the *change of the use, office, and dignity* of the bread, the bread indeed is *sacramentally* changed into the body of Christ,"—we see here what Ridley means by "sacramental" change or "sacramental" presence,—"as the water in baptism is sacramentally changed into the fountain of regeneration." Again: "How vain is it that some so earnestly say, as if it were an infallible rule, that in doctrine and in the institution of the sacraments, Christ used no figures. But some say if we thus admit figures in doctrine, then all the articles of our faith by figures and allegories

will shortly be transformed and unloosed. I say it is a like fault, and even the same, to deny the figure when the phrase so requires to be understood as vainly to make that a figurative speech which is to be understood in its proper signification." And again: "It is plain that, according to Tertullian's exposition (who had said, This is my body, *i. e.*, a figure of my body), Christ meant not by calling the bread his body and the wine his blood, that either the bread was his natural body or the wine his natural blood [which they certainly would have been had they verily and indeed "become" so, however "supernaturally"]; but he called them his body and his blood because he would institute them to be unto us *sacraments*—that is, *holy tokens* and *signs* of his body and blood."

And now one shot from good, hearty, old Latimer—blessed martyr! Ridley writing, to him, charges the "mass sacrifice" as being inconsistent with Christ's. Latimer, in his answer, says: "St. Paul saith, 'They that *serve the altar*, &c. . . . even so hath the Lord ordained that they *which preach the Gospel* should live of the Gospel'—why doth he not rather say, they that *sacrifice in the masses*.'" Ridley's works, page 207.

But Mr. Flanders would fain make his readers believe that even Hooker is on his side in this question. He cites him as follows:—"Why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions whether by consubstantiation or else by transubstantiation the sacrament itself be first possessed of Christ or no?—a thing which can no way either further or hinder us, howsoever it stand, because our participation of Christ in this sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of his omnipotent power, which maketh it his body to us,

whether with change or without alteration of the elements such as they imagine, we need not greatly to care nor inquire."

He then adds the following bravado: "Will Dr. Currie endorse the above? If he will, then he has a right to put himself forward as representing Hooker's teaching on this subject. If he will not, then he ought never to have mentioned his name."

"If Hooker held what he believed of the presence so to depend 'on the co-operation of the omnipotent power of Christ,' that it became indifferent whether it was by consubstantiation or transubstantiation, or by something else, he certainly came very near to making the difference between the Churches 'of no practical moment.'"

Now we will endorse the foregoing from Hooker, and have no doubt that Dr. Currie will endorse it, in the sense in which it was manifestly intended, and which the context will show beyond all question. We marvel at the—shall we call it effrontery? no—the boldness or the naive ignorance of the citation. Did Mr. Flanders know, with such help as he had from others in examining authorities, that the words immediately preceding his citation are: "There is no sentence of Holy Scripture which saith that we cannot by this sacrament be made partakers of his body and blood except they be first contained in the sacrament or the sacrament be converted into them. This is my body, and This is my blood, being words of promise, sith we all agree that by the sacrament Christ doth really and truly in us perform his promise," "why need we vainly trouble ourselves," &c.? If he knew they were there he should not thus have sought to make us

believe that Hooker's "teaching on this subject" is, that "the bread and wine *become* verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ present on the altar." If he did not know they were there,—why, then,—somebody else is probably to blame.

Moreover, Mr. Flanders would insinuate, if not plainly assert, that, in the words quoted, Hooker meant to say that in his view, "it became indifferent whether the presence was (held to be) by consubstantiation or transubstantiation, or by something else." Now, in the first place, it is to be observed, Hooker recognizes no "something else," which Mr. Flanders finds it very important for his case to thrust in. And then, did Mr. Flanders know of Hooker's own note to this passage, which plainly shows that Hooker had no such meaning in it as Mr. Flanders or his friends would foist upon it? "The Christian Letter" had taken the same view of the passage which Mr. Flanders would have us take, viz., that Hooker "seemed to make light of the doctrine of transubstantiation as a matter not to be stood upon or to be contended for, cared for, or inquired into, . . . a thing that neither furthereth nor hindereth," though the article teach that it overthroweth the nature of a sacrament. To this Hooker replies: "Not to be stood upon *by them*, because it is not a thing necessary, although because it is *false*, as long as they do persist to maintain and urge it, there is *no man so gross* as to think in this case we may neglect it. *Against them* it is therefore said, they ought not to stand in it," &c., &c. The upshot of all which is, that, inasmuch as we all agree that in the Holy Supper we have in us, in our hearts, a participation of the body and blood of

Christ, they have no right to disturb the peace of the Church by contending for any antecedent external change in the elements, or any objective, external, literal "presence on the altar,"—of which nothing whatever is said in Holy Scripture. And we subscribe to it heartily.

But to set the matter at rest, and forestall all carping about glosses and interpretations, we take the liberty of having here reprinted at large the context in which Mr. Flanders's citation occurs. Eccles., Pol. V., lxvii. 2.

"This was it that some did exceedingly fear, lest Zwinglius and Ecolampadius would bring to pass that men should account of this sacrament but only as of a shadow, destitute, empty, and void of Christ. But, seeing that by opening the several opinions which have been held, they are grown, for aught I can see, on all sides, at the length to a general agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely, the *real participation* of Christ and of life in his body and blood *by means of this sacrament*, wherefore should the world continue still distracted, and rent with so manifold contentions, when there remaineth now no controversy, saving only about the subject *where* Christ is? Yea, even in this point no side denieth but that *the soul of man* is the receptacle of Christ's presence. Whereby the question is yet driven to a narrower issue, nor doth anything rest doubtful but this, whether, when the sacrament is administered, Christ be whole *within man only*, or else his body and blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated elements themselves; which opinion they that defend are driven to *consubstantiate* and incorporate Christ with elements sacramental, or to *transubstantiate* and change their substance into his, and so the one to hold him really but invisibly moulded up with the substance of those elements, the other to hide him under the only visible show of bread and wine, the substance whereof, as they imagine, is abolished, and his succeeded in the same room. All things considered, and compared with that success which truth hath hitherto had by so bitter conflicts with errors in this point, shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence

what we have by the sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how? If we doubt what those admirable words—this is my body, this is my blood—may import, let him be our teacher for the meaning of Christ to whom Christ was himself a schoolmaster; let our Lord's apostle be our interpreter; content we ourselves with his explication—'my body, *the communion of my body*; my blood, *the communion of my blood*.' Is there anything more expedite, clear, and easy, than that, as Christ is termed our life because through him we obtain life, so the parts of this sacrament are his body and blood, for that they are so to us, who, receiving them, receive that by which they are termed? The bread and cup are his body and blood because they are causes instrumental, upon the receipt whereof the *participation* of his body and blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect is not vainly nor improperly said to be that very effect whereunto it tendeth. Every cause is in the effect which groweth from it. Our souls and bodies quickened to eternal life are the effects, the cause whereof is the person of Christ; his body and blood are the true well-spring, out of which this life floweth. So that his body and blood are in that very subject whereunto they minister life not only by effect or operation, even as the influence of the heavens is in plants, beasts, men, and in everything which they quicken, but also by a far more divine and mystical kind of union, which maketh us one with him even as he and the Father are one. The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament. And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth, first, 'take and eat;' then, 'this is my Body which was broken for you;' first, 'drink ye all of this;' then followeth, 'this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ when and where the bread is His body, or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. As for the sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really, nor do they really contain in themselves, that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow. If on all sides it be confessed that the grace of baptism is poured into the soul of man, that by water we receive it, although it be neither seated in the water nor the water changed into it, what should in-

duce men to think that the grace of the Eucharist must needs be in the Eucharist before it can be in us that receive it? The fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the body and blood of Christ. There is no sentence in Holy Scripture which saith that we cannot by this sacrament be made partakers of his body and blood, except they be first contained in the sacrament, or the sacrament converted into them. 'This is my body,' and 'this is my blood,' being words of promise, since we all agree that by the sacrament Christ doth really and truly in us perform his promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions, whether by consubstantiation or else by transubstantiation the sacrament itself be first possessed with Christ, or no? A thing which no way can either further or hinder us, howsoever it may stand, because our participation of Christ in this sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of his omnipotent power, which maketh it his body and blood to us, whether with change or without alteration of the element, such as they imagine, we need not greatly to care or inquire.

"Take, therefore, that wherein all agree, and then consider by itself what cause why the rest in question should not rather be left as superfluous than urged as necessary. It is on all sides plainly confessed, first, that this sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth himself, even his whole entire person, *as a mystical Head*, unto every soul that receiveth him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as *a mystical member of him*, yea, of them also whom he acknowledgeth to be his own; secondly, that to whom *the person of Christ* is thus communicated, to them he giveth by the same sacrament his holy spirit to sanctify them, as it sanctifieth him which is their head; thirdly, that what *merit, force, or virtue soever there is in his sacrificed body and blood*, we freely, fully, and wholly have it by this sacrament; fourthly, that *the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies* from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life; fifthly, that because the sacrament, being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature, must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are, therefore, to rest ourselves altogether upon *the strength of his glorious power* who is able and will bring to pass that the bread and cup which he giveth us shall be truly the thing he promiseth.

“It seemeth, therefore, much amiss that against them whom they term sacramentaries* so many invective discourses are made, all running upon two points, that the Eucharist is not a bare sign or figure only, and that the efficacy of his body and blood is not all we receive in this sacrament. For no man, having read their books and writings which are thus traduced, can be ignorant that both these assertions they plainly confess to be most true. Again, as evident it is how they teach that Christ is *personally* there present, yea, present whole, albeit a part of Christ be *corporeally* absent from thence; that Christ, assisting his heavenly banquet with his personal and true presence, doth by his own divine power add to the natural substance thereof supernatural efficacy, which addition to the nature of those consecrated elements changeth them, and maketh them that unto us which otherwise they could not be; that to us they are thereby made such instruments as mystically, yet truly, invisibly, yet really, work our communion or fellowship with the person of Jesus Christ as well, in that he is man as God, our participation also in the fruit, grace, and efficacy of his body and blood, whereupon there ensueth a kind of transubstantiation in us, a true change, both of soul and body, an alteration from death to life. In a word, it appeareth not that of all the ancient fathers of the Church, any one did ever conceive or imagine other than only a mystical participation of Christ’s both body and blood in the sacrament, neither are their speeches concerning the change of the elements themselves into the body and blood of Christ such that a man can thereby in conscience assure himself it was their meaning to persuade the world either of a corporeal consubstantiation of Christ with those sanctified and blessed elements before we receive them, or of the like transubstantiation of them into the body and blood of Christ. Which both to our mystical communion with Christ are so unnecessary that the Fathers, who plainly hold but this mystical communion, can not easily be thought to have meant any other change of sacramental elements than that which the same spiritual communion did require them to hold.

“These things considered, how should that mind which, loving truth and seeking comfort out of holy mysteries, hath not perhaps the leisure, perhaps not the wit nor capacity to tread out so endless mazes as the intricate disputes of this cause have led men into,

* This was the term by which the Zwinglians were designated in those times.

how should a virtuously-disposed mind better resolve with itself than thus? ‘Variety of judgments and opinions argueth obscurity in those things whereabout they differ. But that which all parts receive for truth, that which every one having sifted is by no means denied or doubted of, must needs be matter of infallible certainty. Whereas, therefore, there are but three expositions made of ‘this is my body.’ The first: ‘This is in itself before participation *really and truly the natural substance of my body by reason of the co-existence which my omnipotent body hath with the sanctified element of bread,*’ which is the Lutherans’ interpretation. The second: ‘This is itself and before participation *the very true and natural substance of my body, by force of that deity which, with the words of consecration, abolisheth the substance of bread and substituteth in the place thereof my body,*’ which is the Popish construction. The last: ‘*This hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power, is in verity and truth, unto faithful receivers, instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation whereby as I make myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as my sacrificed body can yield, and as their souls do presently need, this is to them and in them my body.*’ Of these three rehearsed interpretations the last hath in it nothing but what the rest do all approve and acknowledge to be most true, nothing but that which the words of Christ are on all sides confessed to enforce, nothing but that which the Church of God hath always thought necessary, nothing but that which alone is sufficient for every Christian man to believe concerning the use and force of this sacrament; finally, nothing but that wherewith the writings of all antiquity are consonant and all Christian confessions agreeable.”*

Hooker then proceeds with a jubilant and glowing rhapsody of devout exultation:—
 “The very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do, as nails, fasten us to his very cross, that by them we draw out, *as touching efficacy, force, and virtue*, even the

* So far the *italics* in Hooker are his own; elsewhere we have *italicised* quotations at discretion.

blood of his gored side; in the wounds of our Redeemer, we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, our hunger is satisfied and our thirst forever quenched. . . . What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that *to me who take them* they are the body and blood of Christ, his promise in witness thereof sufficeth, his word he knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this: O my God, thou art true; O my soul, thou art happy?"

Now, of the three forms of doctrine which Hooker has above described, he clearly adopts the third as his own; and as clearly he understands it to be the Zwinglian doctrine as modified by Calvin.*

He undoubtedly held it to be the doctrine of his Church and of all antiquity. As to the "something else" of Mr. Flanders, he expressly declares that no such something else is possible; that if, besides the inward participation of the body and blood of Christ in the soul of the believer, you will have an external presence of them in or with the elements on the "altar," you are "driven" either to consubstantiation or to transubstantiation. And, plainly, he is right, for no other mode is conceivable without contradiction. If the real, natural body of Christ in its true and proper substance is externally and objectively present on the "altar"—if any other body whatever is really there, it must either be with the elements, or the elements must be changed into it. If you ask Hooker where the presence, the sacramental presence, of the body and blood

* Even Keble admits as much in a note to this passage.

of Christ is, he answers repeatedly and unequivocally, "The soul of man is the receptacle of Christ's presence." "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, ("therefore"—he, again, had reasoned it out, and this is his formal conclusion), is not, therefore, to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament." "I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ when or where the bread is his body or the cup his blood, but *only* in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them."

Evidently Hooker recognizes but three statements of the doctrine of the Supper,—outside of what was *feared* to be the doctrine of Zwinglius,—transubstantiation, consubstantiation, and that which he enunciates as the doctrine of the Church of England. This modern invention does not really differ from the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Both agree that the bread becomes the very, natural body of Christ present on the "altar." The Church of Rome seeks to avoid an absurdity by saying *it becomes so by a change*; this new doctrine swallows the absurdity whole and says *it becomes so without any change*. Aquinas and Bellarmine both explain the Romish doctrine thus: "The body of Christ is not present after the manner of a body—*i. e.*, in its visible form—but it is present spiritually—*i. e.*, invisibly and by the power of the Spirit." This would answer equally well for the Clementine Fathers. But is it reasonable to suppose that a distinct doctrine of the Supper, of which Hooker had never heard, was not only the immemorial "doctrine of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church," but was really held and taught by his own Church in his time?

And thus Dr. Currie is fully justified in claiming the authority of Hooker against the doctrine, not only of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, but also against this monstrous hybrid, which teaches that "the bread and wine become," in some other way, "verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ, not naturally but supernaturally, present on the altar."

The clergy of St. Clement's add, by way of explanation: "The outward elements of bread and wine do not sensibly cease to be what they were before." The Church of Rome says the same, and it is a plain matter of fact, whether they said it or not. "But," say they, "they *become* what they were not before." So says the Church of Rome. Still the Clementine Fathers would add: "We are not Romanists, the difference is world-wide, great enough to die for; we do not say the elements become so by transubstantiation, or by consubstantiation; they become so 'in some other way—we know not how.'" But Hooker says if you would have this external "presence" you are "*driven*," driven as reasonable men, to one or the other. They endeavor to relieve the absurdity by an illustration borrowed from Dr. Pusey: "Even as in the beginning God breathed the breath of life into that body of clay which he had formed, 'and man *became* a living soul.'" But this will not do, gentlemen. Unless that body of clay itself became verily and indeed a living soul, it will not serve your purpose. But most Christians have believed that the soul is a real substance *added* to that of the body, instead of the body having *become* the soul, and so being soul and body both. Neither is it to any purpose for them to appeal, as they sometimes do, to the mystery of the incarnation as a parallel

case ; unless they hold that, in that mystery, the divine nature "becomes" human nature (or conversely), or that the divine person "becomes" another distinct (human) person ; that is to say, unless they "become" Entychians or Nestorians ; while, by a sort of jugglery, they would remain orthodox at the same time.

According to their doctrine, every infinitesimal particle of the bread must have "become" the entire body of Christ ; so that there are an infinite number of such bodies on the "altar ;" for, every communicant, however small a particle of the bread he receives, receives the entire body of Christ. But to say that one body "becomes" another body, not to say an infinite number of other bodies, while it still remains the very same body ; and that, not merely in consecration, or significance, or use, but really, substantially, and in objective fact, is a plain contradiction ; which the theories of transubstantiation and consubstantiation were vainly invented to relieve. If they are rejected, the contradiction is inevitable. It is useless, with a great show of Christian reverence, to talk of a "mystery" or "a miracle." A reasonable man can well believe in a mystery or a miracle, but he can not believe in a contradiction, even though you christen it Mystery or Miracle or even "Supernatural" When we hear our blessed Lord say, This is my body, it is not to honor him or his truth, first to interpret his words as affirming a contradiction, and then to say we humbly believe them in that sense. That is first "to make him a liar," and then to take credit to ourselves for our faith in believing the falsehood which we have invented and charged upon him.

We are all agreed that, in the Holy Supper, the faithful do truly eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, that they feed on him in their hearts by faith. And this is the "eating and drinking," let Mr. Flanders know, which is referred to in the prayer of "Humble Access." There is no "paltering in a double sense" except in his own mind. "Our souls' being washed in the blood of Christ," is of course figurative language, and "our bodies' being cleansed by his body," is no less so. We presume that even he, though imbued with all the "supernatural" materialism of the Clementine Fathers, would not think of a literal washing of our souls in blood. We believe that this eating and drinking is no fiction or fancy, but a blessed spiritual reality; though we do not confine it to the time of receiving the holy communion. In that sacrament we are truly partakers of Christ, though not in that sacrament alone.

Most of the other English divines quoted by Mr. Flanders, as well as Hooker, undoubtedly made their statements in this sense,—they referred to an inward and spiritual eating and drinking. Some of the Laudan school *may* have meant otherwise; and he is welcome to their support. But he has no right to charge Bishop Cosin and Bishop Taylor with maintaining his new fantastical theory, "True it is," says Bishop Cosin, "that the body and blood of Christ are sacramentally and really (not feignedly) present when the blessed bread and wine *are taken* by the faithful communicants; and as true it is also that they are *not present but only* when the hallowed elements are *so taken*, as in another work I have more at large declared. Therefore whosoever so receiveth them, *at that time*

when he receiveth them rightly doth he adore and reverence his Saviour, *then*, together with the sacramental bread and cup, *exhibiting his own body and blood unto him*. Yet because that body and blood is neither sensibly present (nor *otherwise at all present, but only* to them that are duly prepared to receive them, and *in the very act of receiving them*, and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally *in that act united*), the adoration then and there given to Christ himself, neither is nor ought to be *directed* to any external sensible object, such as are the blessed elements."* Works, V. 345.

And in his "other work," he says: "And we also deny that the elements still retain the nature of sacraments when not used according to Divine institution—that is, *given by Christ's ministers and received by his people*; so that Christ in the consecrated bread ought not, *cannot* be preserved to be carried about, *because he is present only to the communicants*." Hist. Pop. Trans., IV. 5.

Jeremy Taylor, from whom so many glowing passages are gathered by the other side, gives in his Treatise on Real Presence and Spiritual, a formal, precise and brief definition of what he means by "the Real Presence." "But we, by the Real Presence of Christ, do understand Christ to be *present in the hearts of the faithful by blessing and grace*; AND THIS IS ALL which we mean BESIDES THE TROPICAL AND FIGURATIVE PRESENCE."

* It will be perceived that Bishop Cosin's "adoration" is not an "adoration of Christ present in the elements under the forms of bread and wine on the altars of our churches," but an adoration of Christ exhibiting, manifesting himself in the soul of the faithful communicant.

Here is the whole matter in a nut-shell, so to speak:—there is a tropical and figurative presence in the elements, and there is a real spiritual presence in the hearts of the faithful, and that, not substantially, but only by blessing and grace.

It is a favorite device with the other side generally, as with Mr. Hunter and Mr. Flanders, to endeavor to associate the views of their opponents, even in relation to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, with the name of Calvin or Knox as a sort of opprobrium; all in "earnest ignorance" of the historical fact that our Church's doctrine of the Supper has been by all Christendom—outside of their school—classed with that of the other so-called "Reformed" (or Calvinistic) churches. Now, as Mr. Flanders cites Bishop Cosin as a witness and an authority for *his* doctrine; let us hear Cosin's testimony on this subject. "Now, because great is the fame of Calvin (who subscribed the Augustan Confession [Lutheran] and that of the Switzers [Zwinglian]), let us hear what he writ and believed concerning this sacred mystery. *His words, in his Institutions and elsewhere, are such, so conformable to the style and mind of the ancient Fathers, that no Catholic reformer would desire to use any others.*" He then cites profusely from Calvin in proof of his assertion. But in regard to the sacraments, says Mr. Hunter, "our Church opposes Zwingle, Luther, and Calvin, and all Puritans of whatever name." Our readers can judge which is or was better qualified to decide upon the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, or of that of the Switzers, or of the Institutes of John Calvin, or of our own Church herself,—Bishop Cosin, or Messrs. Hunter and Flanders,—though one of these gentlemen

claims the authority of a life-long student, and the other is a member of the Philadelphia bar. But "we are the men," "all the learning is on our side," "we will tell you what the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church is"!

Our Article XXVIII. declares that "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the supper of the Lord can not be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Holy Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Now is it credible that the authors of that article regarded the doctrine of transubstantiation as a matter of indifference? Or is it credible that they were in "earnest and complete ignorance" of what the Romish Church meant by it? Yet Mr. Hunter says: "Taking that word (substance) as our formularies do, of course all that they say about transubstantiation is true. But the defenders of this doctrine deny our meaning of the term substance. We may leave it to the Theologians." So, it is a mere question of words, and the article is mere *brutum fulmen*. And now, if this was so, can it be supposed that the framers of our articles fully admitted and indeed maintained that the bread and wine "become" verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ "present on the altar," and yet meant to say that merely holding the mode in which they "become" so to be by transubstantiation, is what overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions? Is not their meaning clearly this, that, inasmuch as the nature or the very idea of a Sacrament includes "an outward, visible sign, and an inward and spiritual grace" thereby signified, if you

transform the sign outwardly into, or let it really become externally, the very thing signified by it, then the outward thing *is, has become*, the thing signified, the "sacrament" is destroyed, and both sign and thing signified, as such, disappear together? And, pray, to what superstitions has the doctrine of transubstantiation given rise, to which this doctrine of a real, literal presence of the very body and blood of Christ on the "altar" does not equally tend to give occasion? whether high masses or solitary communions, reserving the host as a kind of charm, carrying it about, elevating or worshipping it? Surely the belief in the assumed fact that it is literally the real, proper, natural body of Christ which is there, and not the philosophical theory as to how it became so, is the thing which gives occasion to the superstitions.

And this brings us to the question of

"EUCHARISTIC ADORATION."

In Christ the divine and the human natures are inseparably joined in the unity of his person. The presence of the humanity of Christ, as mediated by this union with the divinity, though the manner of it be to us incomprehensible, is and must always be *everywhere alike*. The presence of his humanity, as such, in its proper finite nature, is now in heaven only. The special manifestation of his presence by the power of his Spirit is made, not in any external things, but both objectively and subjectively in the hearts and souls of his believing people. There, as Hooker says, "is the receptacle of his presence." Christ may and should be adored everywhere; he will be especially and grate-

fully adored by those to whom he especially and graciously manifests himself. But to worship him as especially present in any external object that is regarded as representing him or veiling his presence, is idolatry. And this last is supposed to be what is now meant by "Eucharistic Adoration." To the adoration of Christ at all times and in all places no Christian will think of making objection. It is against this special adoration directed in thought or in bodily act towards an external object as representing or veiling him, that we contend, as being contrary to the doctrine of our Protestant Episcopal Church.

Our Church declares that "the sacraments were not ordained to be gazed upon or to be carried about, but that *we should duly use them*, and in such only as *worthily receive* the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation." And it can scarcely be doubted that of the many superstitions to which the doctrine of transubstantiation is alleged to have given occasion, one of the greatest was the directing of acts of worship towards the elements of the Lord's Supper, or towards the pyx or the chalice in which they were held up to be gazed upon,—in short, the adoration of the host or *consecrated* wafer. But surely such acts of worship are not relieved of the charge of superstition and idolatry—but quite the contrary—when the consecrated elements are admitted to remain there in their proper natural substance, instead of being presumed to be actually transmuted into the very substance of the body and blood of Christ, and thus to have ceased to be bread and wine at all.

In the Homily "Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament," we read: "But before all things this we must be

sure of especially that this Supper be in such wise done and ministered as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done, as his Holy Apostles used it and the good fathers in the Primitive Church frequented it.

. We must then take heed, lest, of the memory it be made a sacrifice, lest, of a communion it be made a private eating," &c. "St. Paul, blaming the Corinthians for the profaning of the Lord's Supper, concludeth that ignorance both of *the thing itself* and of *the signification* thereof was the cause of their abuse. For what hath been the cause of the ruin of God's religion but the ignorance hereof? What hath been the cause of this gross idolatry but the ignorance hereof? What has been the cause of this mummish massing but the ignorance hereof?" "And to be brief, thus much more the faithful see, hear, and know, the favorable mercies of God sealed, the satisfaction of Christ towards us confirmed, and the remission of sin established. Have, with this knowledge, a sure and constant faith, stick fast to Christ's promise made in his institution, make Christ thine own and apply his merits unto thyself. Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest, no mass, no means established by man's invention."

Mr. Flanders affects to make himself merry over Dr. Currie for having spoken of "Eucharistic adoration" as an adoration of "the elements"; and says: "This is a meaning which no theologian has ever attached to this expression." Mr. Flanders, then, is the theologian of theologians! And yet, among his patristic authorities, he has the following from Theodoret: "The mystical symbols are thought of as that which they have

become, and are believed to be so, and are worshipped as being those things which they are believed to be." Here we have the express assertion: "The mystical symbols are worshipped." Was Theodoret a theologian? or was he as much of an ignoramus as Dr. Currie? Will Mr. Flanders "endorse" his statement? "If not, he ought never to have mentioned his name"; and still more, he ought never to have cited these very words. Indeed, this lofty assumption of the swing and swagger of great learning, of knowing all theology, history, and antiquity, and so, looking down upon their opponents with sovereign contempt as ignorant and narrow-minded bigots and blunderers, is an old trick of our friends on the other side. The Jesuit Harding had it many years ago. They seem to think that, unless a man has conned their pet authors and got at his fingers' ends their stock quotations from fathers and liturgies and a certain school of ecclesiastics—quotations which they have transcribed and repeated and passed from hand to hand until they are smoothly worn from all relation to the context from which they were taken—why, then, forsooth, he is no theologian, "he *don't*" know how to "put things together."

Now, as for all the quotations which Mr. Flanders (or his Clementine Fathers) has made from the ancient liturgies and the early fathers in defense of his doctrine of Eucharistic Adoration, all of them, with the exception of that from Theodoret (to which he is quite welcome), if rightly explained in their relation to their context and to the use of speech in their time, and by the key which St. Augustine has already furnished us, will be found to give no support to his doctrine at all. Indeed, there is scarcely anything in the quotations

from the liturgies, as they stand (with the exception, perhaps, of that from the Syriac of St James), which seems even plausibly to support such a doctrine. But the weakness of his case is made most palpable by his actually putting forward our own liturgy as his strongest witness, which he does with evident exultation. All his readers, therefore, without waiting to make themselves masters of all the ancient liturgies and early fathers, can judge for themselves of the strength of his argument. Does our Church in her liturgy teach "the adoration of Christ present under the sacred species * there on the altar," by acts of worship directed towards the "sacred species" and the holy table? "Yes," says Mr. Flanders, "she has brought into our liturgy the great act of adoration. She has set herself to make and has succeeded in making herself truly primitive." And how so? Why, "the hymns" she has appointed to be sung at the holy supper "are all hymns of adoration and some of them of intense adoration." Truly this must have been an unconscious act of our Church, and Mr. Flanders seems to hint that it was so. He can not help knowing that the Bishops and the whole Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church that first introduced those hymns, and the great body of this Church since, were and have been innocent of any intention to use those hymns for such a purpose as he thinks they accomplish. Why, the use of such hymns is a miserable Protestant invention. They belong to "Pennsylvania Protestant Episcopalianism." Of the "rubric" which appoints their use, Mr. Flanders says :

* A term, by the way, which smacks strongly of the Romish transubstantiation and "accidents."

"The like of it, so far as we know, does not exist anywhere else in Christendom." Such a *rubric* may not exist elsewhere, but such a practice exists in all Protestant—precisely, in all Protestant—Christendom. And, what is more, of these nine hymns appointed to be sung at the Holy Communion, two are from Philip Doddridge and one from Isaac Watts, (who, Mr. Flanders may possibly know, were English dissenters.) And, what is more still, Doddridge has furnished one of the very three which Mr. Flanders expressly emphasizes: "Hail sacred feast, which Jesus makes." And we can not stop even here. Watts divided his hymns into three books, and appropriated the whole third book to hymns for the Lord's Supper. Suppose, now, we select from these a *catena* of quotations in favor of the doctrine of "Eucharistic Adoration."

(1.)—In the hymn contained in our Hymnal:—

“Worthy the Lamb our lips reply
 For he was slain for us.
 Jesus is worthy to receive
 Honor and power divine,
 And blessings more than we can give
 Be, Lord, forever thine.
 The whole creation join in one
 To bless the sacred name
 Of him that sits upon the throne
 And to adore the Lamb.”

(2.)—“Jesus, thy feast we celebrate
 We shew thy death, we sing thy name,
 Till thou return, and we shall eat
 The marriage supper of the Lamb.”

(3.)—“Let us adore th’ eternal word,
 ’Tis he our soul has fed;
 Thou art the living stream, O Lord,
 And thou th’ immortal bread.”

- (4.)—"To him that washed us in his blood
Be everlasting praise,
Salvation, honor, glory, power,
Eternal as his days."
- (5.)—"How rich are thy provisions, Lord,
Thy table furnished from above,
The fruits of life o'erspread the board,
The cup o'erflows with heavenly love."
- (6.)—"How sweet and awful is the place
With Christ within the doors!
[The real presence!
The tremendous sacrifice!]
While everlasting love displays
The choicest of her stores."
- (7.)—"Here have we seen thy face, O Lord,
And viewed salvation with our eyes,
Tasted and felt the living Word,
The bread descending from the skies."
- (8.)—"Our hymns should sound like those above,
Could we our voices raise;
Yet, Lord, our hearts shall all be love,
And all our voices praise."
- (9.)—"Salvation to the name
Of our adored Christ,
Through the wide earth his grace proclaim,
His glory in the high'st."
- (10.)—"Jesus, we bow before thy feet,
Thy table is divinely stored;
Thy sacred flesh and blood we eat,
'Tis living bread; we thank thee, Lord.
And here we drink our Saviour's blood,
We thank thee, Lord; 'tis generous wine
Mingled with love; the fountain flowed
From that dear bleeding heart of thine."
- (11.)—"Lord, we adore thy bounteous hand,
And sing the solemn feast,
Where sweet celestial dainties stand
For every willing guest."
- (12.)—"Our spirits join t' adore the Lamb;
Oh that our feeble lips could move
In strains immortal as his name,
And melting as his dying love."

But enough. We leave our readers to compare this *catena* from Watts with that of Mr. Flanders from the ancient liturgies and early fathers, and say which is strongest in teaching his doctrine of "Eucharistic Adoration." Yet it is well known that Watts's psalms and hymns have been freely used by all denominations of English-speaking Protestant Christians, and particularly by the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists, for several generations; and, for a considerable period, were used by them to the exclusion of any other book of hymns. Have all these denominations held and practised the "Eucharistic Adoration" of Mr. Flanders? If so, they were certainly "in earnest and complete ignorance" of it themselves. Did our Church borrow it from Philip Doddridge and Isaac Watts? Clearly, there is better evidence of this than he has given that she derived it either from the primitive liturgies or the early fathers. And here, as in a truthful mirror, we may see the logical value of all his "theological" lore.

Against all the conclusions from the devout rhetoric of liturgies and fathers and hymns, we set the well-considered rubric which is appended by authority to the communion office of the Church of England, and which is quite as likely to express the theological doctrine of our Church as any old liturgy or father, not to say, as any hymn of Philip Doddridge or Isaac Watts.

"Whereas, it is ordained, in this office for the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling (which order is well meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ herein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding

of such profanation and disorder in the holy communion as might otherwise ensue), yet lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of igno-

¹ "Ignorance"
—only think.

rance¹ and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved, it is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done either unto the sacramental bread and wine then bodily received, or unto any corporal

² And observe that no ignorance or stupidity could have been so great as to think that adoration was thus given to Christ's natural flesh and blood there visibly and *naturally* present.

³ They have not "become" any other substance.

⁴ Which means his present *spiritual* body. (See Jeremy Taylor, as cited by Mr. Flanders.)

presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood.²

For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances³ and, therefore, may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians), and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ⁴ are in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." And, surely, we

may add, equally against the truth of any natural body (as long as it is *body*) to be properly, really, literally, two distinct bodies at one and the same time.

It is true that, notwithstanding this plain law of the Church of England, the Court of Arches, in the Bennet case, refused to condemn the respondent for the use of the following language:—"I believe in the real actual presence of our Lord under the form of bread and wine upon the altars of our churches," and "I myself adore and teach my people to adore Christ present in the elements under the form of bread and wine, believing that under this veil is the sacred body and blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."* And the

* It is curious that Harding, the Jesuit, puts it in almost the same words: "In the primitive times," says he, "faithful people worshipped the body and blood

Supreme Court of Appeal, while indignantly repelling the assertion of the judge of the court below that these words express the doctrine of the Church of England or of her great divines, nevertheless affirmed the judgment and dismissed the complaint. This apparently contradictory result is to be explained by two facts: (1.) That every man must be at liberty to adore his Saviour anywhere and everywhere and at all times, the only question being to what may he *direct* his acts of adoration; and (2.) that these words had been carefully pruned from others more unequivocal, until—whatever those who uttered them might mean by them—they were, just by the narrowest possibility, susceptible of such a spiritual and symbolical interpretation that they might be tolerated in the Church of England, or that a man was not to be degraded from his office or deprived of his income because he used them. But the highest tribunal declared that they do *not express the doctrine of the Church of England or of her great divines*. And the practical decision leaves those who

of Christ under the forms of bread and wine.” And Bishop Jewel bends himself, with all his might, to refute him. It is also remarkable that the most plausible citation furnished to Mr. Flanders from the old fathers—that from St. Augustine, in which he speaks of “worshipping the footstool”—is borrowed entire from Harding in his argument in favor of Eucharistic adoration. But Jewel replies: “As we eat *so* we adore it. We eat it sitting in heaven at the right hand of God; thither we lift up our hearts, and then we adore it. St. Ambrose saith: ‘Stephen, standing in the earth, toucheth the Christ being in heaven.’ Again, ‘We touch Christ by faith.’ And again, ‘Stephen seeth Christ being *absent* within the heavens.’ . . . And in this passage Augustine expoundeth and openeth his own meaning: ‘Understand you spiritually what I have said unto you.’ Is it not evident that the conflict which Jewel had with the Jesuit Harding is the very same which is again forced upon us by Mr. Flanders and his Clementine Fathers? Whether Jewel’s answer was sufficient or not, it is plainly as pertinent in reply to Mr. Flanders as to the Jesuit. It can not be pretended that there is anything in it limited to the precise doctrine of transubstantiation as distinguished from the new doctrine of the “Real Presence.”

use them very much in the position of persons who should claim that they come up to all the Church requires to fit them to receive the holy communion, if they "are not open and notorious evil livers, and have done no wrong to their neighbors by word or deed, so that the congregation is thereby offended;" for, if persons in such a case were by a rector repelled from the communion, the law would compel him to receive them. But the question we are discussing is not what may be barely *tolerated* in the State Church in England, but what is the true, honest doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

The doctrinal and legal position of our Church, as she understands it herself, may be seen by reference to her canons, where she expressly recognizes as among "ceremonies and practices not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines: (a.) The elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such a manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects *towards* which adoration is to be made; (b.) Any act of adoration of or *toward* the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, genuflexions," &c.

As to the adoring of the "Presence" by the people while the priest partakes alone, it will be seen that the Homily above quoted condemns "a private eating" instead of "a communion;"—and with good reason. For, did not Christ at the institution of the holy Supper expressly say, "Take, eat, drink ye all of this; do this in remembrance of me"? and St. Paul adds: "for as often as ye *eat* this bread and *drink* this cup, ye do

show the Lord's death till he come." "This do"—*hoc facite*—is not to offer a sacrifice or celebrate a mass, but to *eat this bread and drink this cup*;—*that* is what we are to *do* in remembrance of our Lord, and in *doing that* we show his death. It is no less than a pagan perversion and depravation of the Lord's Supper to adore the pretended external presence, while we refrain from eating the bread and drinking the cup; for it is only *in* the eating and drinking that we have the Lord's sacramental presence—always a spiritual, inward presence—that we show his death, fulfill his dying command, and thus receive the benefits of a participation of his most blessed body and blood. See again Hooker, Cosin, and Taylor, above cited.

Jewel, in his Apology, says: "To this banquet we think the people of God ought to be earnestly bidden, that they may all communicate among themselves, and openly declare and testify both the godly society which is among them, and also the hope which they have in Christ Jesus. For this cause if there had been any which would be a looker-on, and abstain from the holy communion, him did the old fathers and Bishops of Rome in the Primitive Church, before private mass came up, excommunicate as a wicked person, and as a pagan. Neither was there any Christian at that time which did communicate alone while others looked on."

To which Harding replies, "Not seldom the priest at the mass (which for this respect with unreasonable novelty ye term private), when none other were disposed to receive with him sacramentally, but spiritually only, hath [in the the primitive time] received alone the holy things which he hath offered." Could Mr. Flanders himself have answered better?

But Jewel's note is: "Untruth, for St. Chrysostom calleth them '*impudentes et improbos.*'" Can any "ancient liturgy" or any "early fathers" be quoted in favor of solitary communion? Can any early divine of the English Church be quoted in favor of solitary communion? It is a striking fact that the very name "Mass" is a historical protest against the priest celebrant's receiving alone, while the congregation adore the "Presence;" for the word is said to have originated from the fact that when the minister or bishop was about to celebrate the Holy Supper, he dismissed all those who were not to communicate, saying: "*Ite, missa est*" (ecclesia?); which the Roman use now puts after the celebration instead of before it. But, with all this, they need to make another change, for their missal still contains an echo of the ancient usage and a testimony against solitary communion in retaining the plural "we" in the post-communion prayer:—" *Quod ore sumpsimus,*" "*fiat nobis,*" &c.

As to the doctrine and law of our Church on this subject:—from the exhortation required to be used in the Communion Office, from its very name, "Administration of the Lord's Supper," from the directions in the order of the administration of the bread and of the cup, and from the requirement of some other persons to be present and partaking even at the Communion of the Sick, as well as from the whole history of the Church, it is manifest that they are inconsistent with these solitary "masses."

As for the requirement or making a conscience of receiving the communion fasting, and, it may be added, as for prayers for the dead, and praying and bowing towards the altar, or towards the east, and using the

sign of the cross as a gesture in the communion office, or in the daily service of the Church; however "holy catholic or apostolic" these practices may be claimed to be, they clearly do not belong to "the religion either of the Bible or of the prayer-book." Our Lord sat down—reclined—with the twelve. He instituted the Holy Supper immediately *after* the paschal meal. His apostles received it together, receiving with it the command to do the same in remembrance of him. Neither in the institution, nor elsewhere, is he recorded to have said one word of praying for the dead, or of bowing towards the altar, or towards the east, or of making the sign of the cross; nor is he recorded to have done any of these things himself. With the same simplicity the apostles were accustomed to break bread from house to house. If, now, you inquire for primitive practice, none more primitive than that can be found. If you inquire what decent rites and ceremonies have since been established by the authority of the Church for the more solemn celebration of this sacrament, the prayer-book expresses the latest and the decisive authority of the Church; and the prayer-book, while unequivocally condemning solitary communion, is as silent on the other points as were our blessed Lord and his holy apostles. To practice those usages, therefore, if not sheer superstition and volunteered humility, is, at least, not to conform to the discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

"AURICULAR CONFESSION."

In entering upon this subject, Mr. Flanders, in a note, (or his Clementine Fathers,) indulges in a serio-comic

travesty of a statement of Dr. Currie, which statement, fairly considered, has a great deal of truth in it.* But Mr. Flanders, having dressed it up to suit himself, and mocked it at pleasure with expressions of coarse and ungentlemanly personality, suddenly emerges into a solemn (professional?) air with the warning words: "The full and dreadful consequences of this sort of teaching will probably never be known until the eternal world opens upon us."

We will not presume to forecast the revelations of that world; but we will venture to say that "the full and dreadful consequences" upon public and private morals of the system of auricular confession in its most palmy days, as at the period of the Protestant Reformation, have not been such as to encourage us to hope for any very desirable results from it in the eternal world. Let the state of morals and religion in any country where that system is now in full blast be compared with the moral and religious condition of those Protestant communities in which it has been abolished, and we have no fears of the result. It is to little purpose to talk of *abuse*; where a system has its full and free development, it is there it exhibits its true character.

We may consider the subject of auricular confession in its relation to the doctrine and discipline either of the Church of England or of our own Protestant

* Dr. Currie probably meant that there are certain forms of sin and those with which, unfortunately, the confessional seems most prone to meddle,—whose occasions and scenes and circumstances and associations, when gone over in the mind, tend rather to increase than to diminish the propensity to commit them. The guilt and horror of the sin are not to be forgotten; but the details and pictures are to be banished from the imagination. Detailed descriptions of sin and crime are not profitable food for the mind either in reading or in thinking.

Episcopal Church. We shall find that there is a very wide difference between the two cases. Mr. Flanders would have us think otherwise. He asks: "What does the Church in the United States teach? or rather,—for she asserts that she does not intend to depart, and has not departed, from the Church of England,—what has the Church of the United States inherited from the Church of England in the matter of auricular confession?" Now we know of no "Church *of* the United States;" but we do know of "the Protestant Episcopal Church *in* the United States;" and the statement in the parenthesis may serve as an illustration of Mr. Flanders's free treatment of his authorities. The "assertion" to which he refers is contained in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, in the following words:—"It seems unnecessary to enumerate all the different alterations and amendments. They will appear, and it is to be hoped the reasons of them also, upon a comparison of this with the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. In which it will also appear that this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship, or further than local circumstances require." Mr. Flanders leaves out the important words "in any essential point;" and transforms a confident appeal to the judgment of others into a positive assertion. If the Church of England retains any relic of the doctrine or teaching of auricular confession, our Church would not regard it as departing from the doctrine or discipline of that Church "in any essential point,"—though Mr. Flanders and some others might so regard it,—if she even abolished the

practice altogether, or at least, so far as it was connected with private priestly absolution. We are not to determine whether our Church has in her liturgy departed from that of the Church of England by first determining for ourselves what are essential points of doctrine or worship, but by a simple comparison of the liturgies themselves. It is a question of simple fact. Our Church trusts that whoever compares the two liturgies will find that they do not differ in any essential points. She thinks they do not so differ, though any reader,—Mr. Flanders, for example,—might think otherwise. But if he did he would not be thereby authorized to deny the fact of the difference. Shall our Church show in the very text of her prayer-book what she “has inherited from the Church of England”? or shall Mr. Flanders prescribe as an inheritance what she has openly rejected and expunged?

As to Mr. Flanders’s idea of the inherent divine power of the “priest” received in his “commission from Jesus Christ himself” and not subject in its exercise to any rules, canons, or regulations which the Church may prescribe, so that, having been clothed with the authority to “forgive and retain sins,” he may go around absolving and condemning right and left whom, when, where, and how he pleases, without let or hindrance, we think it will hardly bear examination. Not only is the “priest” in the exercise of this part, as of the rest of his office, subject, as Bingham says, “to the rules which Christ has ordained,” but also to the rules which the Church may prescribe. And, moreover, he is under a solemn vow to submit to them. He promised at his ordination “always so to

minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, *and as this Church hath received the same*, according to the commandments of God, so as to teach the people committed to (his) care and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same." He has promised, also, "Reverently to obey (his) bishop and other chief ministers, who, according to the canons of the Church, may have the charge and government over (him), following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting (himself) to their godly judgments."

Every person, before he can be ordained to the ministry of our Church, is required by our Constitution to subscribe the following declaration: "And I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States." Whereinsoever, then, the liturgy of our Church is different from that of the Church of England, he has solemnly engaged to *conform* to the liturgy of our Church, and not to that of the Church of England.

It does not appear to what purpose this claim of inherent power in the priest, by virtue of his very commission to forgive sins, is alleged here under the head of auricular or private confession, unless private *priestly absolution* is, after the confession, to be given to the penitent. This is allowed in the Church of England, but is it in ours? If our Church has made changes in this matter from the discipline of the Church of England, it is not to condemn the discipline of that Church, but to improve upon it. The arrangements in regard to absolution in that Church had been, as

they still are, *abused* to the support of uncatholic as well as unprotestant error; and our Church meant to forestall the errors and abuses by removing their occasion. If Mr. Flanders's idea of liberty in this matter is, that, though our Church may have omitted from her liturgy anything contained in that of the Church of England, yet, if she has not expressly forbidden it, her ministers are at liberty to retain the use of what has been thus omitted; then we have to ask him, to what purpose have the omissions been made, or the Prayer-Book been revised or changed at all? And what should hinder the introduction in our Church of the use of Sarum, or the Roman breviary,—for that was once in use in the "*Church of England*,"—or the worship of the Virgin Mary, not to say of Jupiter or Buddha or Brahma; none of which are otherwise forbidden in our Prayer-Book except as that Book is appointed to to be *used* in our Church?

But let us note what are the divergences between the two liturgies in this matter of "Auricular or Private Confession."

(1.) At the imposition of hands in the ordination of priests, our Church has added an alternate formula to that exclusively used in the Church of England, in which the words "Receive the Holy Ghost," and, "Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained," are omitted. It runs thus: "Take thou authority to execute the office of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments." Here the description of

the office of a Priest in the Church of God is, that he should be a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of his sacraments; but, except as contained under these, there is not a word of the power of absolution or of forgiving sins. No further power of this kind can be intended to be conveyed in the other formula, unless some priests receive in ordination more power than others. And the power actually bestowed in the formula "whose sins," &c., must be determined by the Church's interpretation and intention, and not by the interpretation or choice of Mr. Flanders or of the Clementine Fathers. It is true that some men on that side are said to have expressed serious doubts whether the ordinations of the American Church by this alternate formula were really valid, inasmuch as Christ's "commission," "whosoever sins," &c., is not contained in it; in blessed and innocent ignorance of the fact that it was not till the depth of the darkness of the Middle Ages—that is, till the twelfth or thirteenth century—that those words were introduced at all into the formula for the ordination of priests;* a remarkable illustration of the profound learning which they claim as their especial patrimony.

(2.) After the confession in the order for morning and evening prayer, the English liturgy has, "The absolution or remission of sins;" instead of our "Declaration of the absolution," &c.

* It may be interesting to Mr. Flanders to learn that this formula has never been used at the ordination of priests in the Diocese of Pennsylvania, the venerable Bishop White, in his long and honored episcopate, having set the example and established the precedent. Perhaps this will confirm Mr. F. in his odd fancy that "Pennsylvania Protestant Episcopalianism is not the religion of the Prayer-Book," for it is plain that all along he means the English Prayer-Book and not our own.—But we run our risk; we give him the benefit of the argument.

(3.) In the Communion office it has, "Then shall the priest pronounce this absolution;" instead of our "Then shall the priest say."

(4.) At the close of the warning for the Holy Communion, after having expressly stated that the *proper means* of preparing worthily to partake of the Holy Communion is self-examination, bewailing of sin, *confession to Almighty God*, amendment of life, restitution when required, forgiveness of others, and, even in cases of the grossest crimes, true repentance,—the English liturgy adds: "If there be any of you who, *by this means*, cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief, that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruples and doubtfulness." Whereas, our liturgy, having prescribed the same ordinary means of preparation as the English Liturgy, and having premised the same case of extraordinary difficulty, concludes thus: "let him come to me or to some other minister of God's word and open his grief; that he may receive such godly counsel and advice as may tend to the quieting," &c. *But not a word of "absolution."*

(5.) In the office for the visitation of the sick, the English liturgy contains the following: "Now shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest

shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it after this sort: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offenses; and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." All this is entirely omitted and expunged from our Liturgy; nor is there anywhere in the visitation office a syllable of a confession to be made to the priest or of an absolution to be given by him. "The minister" (who may be but a deacon) "is to examine the sick person whether he truly repent him of his sins," &c. The minister then offers a prayer, says a psalm, and adds another prayer and a benediction, and then the rubric provides that he "may use any part of the service of this book which in his discretion he shall think convenient to the occasion." But certainly he may not, under this rubric, use the form of absolution provided in the English liturgy, for it is not "in this book;" neither can he honestly or with any propriety bring in here either of the declarations of absolution provided in this book, for plainly that was not intended, and it would be quite out of place,—the examination in regard to repentance for sin having been made some time before, and a psalm and several prayers having intervened. Moreover, there is nothing in the whole service which a deacon may not use, the visitor being always called the "minister" and not a priest.

(6.) The Church of England has no special office for the visitation of prisoners. In the office for that purpose provided by our Church, the minister (not

necessarily a priest) is to exhort the prisoner to examine himself, to bewail his sinfulness, to *confess himself to Almighty God* with full purpose of amendment, &c., as in the communion office. The minister is then to examine him concerning his faith, and "whether he repent him truly of his sins, and be in charity with all the world, and further admonish him particularly concerning the crimes wherewith he is charged, and exhort him, if he have any scruples, that he would declare the same, and prepare himself for the holy communion against the time that it may be proper to administer it to him." But not a word is said about a detailed confession or any absolution at all.

In the extreme case of a person *under sentence of death*, "the minister," in his exhortation, is to require him strictly to examine himself and his estate both toward God and toward man, and to let *no worldly consideration* hinder him from making a true and full confession of his sins, and giving all the satisfaction which is in his power to every one whom he hath wronged or injured. Then "the minister" is to examine him concerning his faith; and "whether he repent him truly of his sins, exhorting him to a particular confession of the sin for which he is condemned, and upon confession he shall instruct him what satisfaction he ought to make," &c. Thus it is evident that the "true and full confession of his sins" in the exhortation above is the same as the "particular confession of the sin for which he is condemned." Thus far the "minister" may be only a deacon, who could not pronounce the formal priestly absolution, even if the formal confession were made to him. But now, if he be a priest, it is added, "After his confession, the priest

shall declare to him the pardoning mercy of God, in the form which is used in the communion service." And this is the only relic that is left in our Church's liturgy of private confession with private absolution. *It is confined to the case of a criminal under sentence of death.* The "absolution" is very different from the English, "I absolve thee." It is substantially a prayer to God in behalf of the prisoner, containing, in an indirect clause or parenthesis, a general declaration of the pardoning mercy of God "to all those who with hearty repentance and true faith turn to him." The prisoner having received it, could not say or think that the priest had absolved *him*, had forgiven *his sins*; the priest has prayed that God would pardon *his* sins, and assured him that God will forgive *all those* who truly repent and believe. And this assurance of the Gospel from the mouth of God's minister, and this "prayer of a righteous man" may avail much both for the comfort of the doomed man and for obtaining the pardoning mercy of God.

Now we neither need nor wish to contend that the provisions of the English liturgy, where they differ from ours, are in themselves essentially wrong. We believe that their purpose was right and good, and according to that purpose and the idea of the Church, they are maintained and defended by the English divines. The private confession was to be required of no man in preparation for the Holy Communion. Men were to be taught that the proper "means" for that preparation, even in the case of grievous and mortal sins, was repentance and "confession to Almighty God;" and only in extreme cases of weak and burdened consciences, or of the sick and dying, were

private confession and absolution allowed. It is notorious that the general use of private confession and absolution, *the institution of the confessional*, disappeared from the Church of England from the time of the Protestant Reformation. Having an eye to the teaching of the modern Ritualists on this subject, the bishops at the late Lambeth Conference, without a dissenting voice, declared that, in their deliberate opinion, no minister of the Church is authorized " to *enjoin or even encourage* the practice of habitual confession to a priest, or to teach that such practice of habitual confession, or the being subject to what has been termed the direction of a priest, is a condition of attaining to the highest spiritual life." The Clementine Fathers, with Mr. Flanders and the rest of their people, can say for themselves whether the teaching and practice of those fathers has been in conformity with this voice of the Anglican Communion. It is very plain that every man, in our Church or out of it, has an undoubted right to confess his sins to whomsoever he will; and ministers of the gospel have authority and commandment to declare and proclaim and pronounce anywhere and everywhere the pardoning mercy of God,—that God is ready to forgive the sins of all who truly repent and believe. Our Church has also provided, what would be understood, of course, even if it had not been expressly provided, and what is understood and practised among all bodies of Protestant Christians, that the ministers of God's word should give godly counsel and advice to burdened consciences which open to them their griefs. But our Church has not provided that priestly absolution should be given in private to any except to

convicts under sentence of death; nor has she, in her liturgy, authorized the priest to say to any man anywhere, as an official act, "I absolve thee from all thy sins." Therefore, the people at St. Clement's cannot go to confess their sins in private to the priest with a view of receiving the absolution, whether precatory or declaratory, unless they are criminals under sentence of death; and if the clergy of St. Clement's neither enjoin nor even encourage habitual confession to a priest as needful to a comfortable assurance of forgiveness or as a condition of attaining a higher spiritual life, nor give to any priestly absolution in private, whence comes it that there should be more people at St. Clement's who practise such confession than in our other churches? Are there more burdened consciences there than elsewhere which cannot find relief by "the means" which the Church recommends as the proper means for that purpose, even in the cases of the grossest sins, as "blasphemy, slandering of God's word, adultery, being in malice or envy, or in any other grievous crime"? If so, why should it be so?

Mr. Flanders wonders that Dr. Currie can remain in our Church with his principles, and yet "say to his people every Sunday morning and every Sunday evening" these words:—"Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn from his wickedness and live, hath given power and commandment to his ministers *to declare and pronounce to his people being penitent the absolution and remission of their sins.*" He may wonder still more if we tell him that Dr. Currie, with his principles or without

them, may remain all his life in the ministry of our Church, obey every rubric in the prayer-book, and yet never say those words to his people from the beginning of his ministry to the end of it. Mr. Flanders (or his prompters) evidently forgets that, in *our* liturgy, there is another form of the declaration of absolution in the order for morning and evening prayer which Dr. Currie may sometimes—not to say always—use. Indeed, he seems all along to be more familiar with and more concerned about the so-called liturgies of St. Mark and St. James and St. Chrysostom, with the use of Sarum with the first prayer-book of Edward VI., and the present liturgy of the Church of England, than he is with that of his own Church. On this subject one would suppose he took the English liturgy to be that prescribed in our Church, though on the subject of the Supper he is very careful to mark the difference. The *italics* in the citation above made are his. He evidently thinks those words very important. But it is more to be wondered at how, with his principles, a minister can remain in a church where, after uttering those grand words, he is obliged, by way of interpreting and applying them, to follow with such a lame and impotent conclusion—lame and impotent on his principles; magnificent and glorious on ours. “The priest hath power and commandment to declare and pronounce absolution”—yes, “p-r-o-n-o-u-n-c-e *absolution*.” Well, let us hear how he does it. “He pardoneth and absolveth all those who truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy gospel. Wherefore, let us beseech him to grant us true repentance and his Holy Spirit.” What is this but the general announcement of the

gospel, which any man has authority to make, followed by an exhortation to a common prayer that we may be brought under the necessary condition? This declaration—with the “*pronouncing*” added—conveys absolutely to no individual particular soul the forgiveness of his sins. It does not make anything true which was not true before. It is not true because the priest declares it, but the priest declares it because it is true; and it is just as true when declared by any other man as when declared by a priest.* *But Christ and his Church would have it solemnly declared and proclaimed by somebody.* Therefore it is made the especial office and the bounden *duty* of the priest to declare and pronounce it, and it is the great comfort of the people to receive the assurance as thus solemnly pronounced by the mouth of Christ’s own minister. Any man may proclaim the gospel, or any part of it, and even a layman may sometimes do it with good effect; but a layman may not assume to do it with official authority. The presbyter preaches the gospel with official authority as a minister of Christ, and it is his *duty* to preach the

* The editor of the *Directorium Anglicanum*, the Rev. Frederic George Lee, D. C. L., who, it is presumed, will be acknowledged by Mr. Flanders as one who has some “authority,” and “knows how to put things together,” says expressly “There is nothing of a distinctive sacerdotal nature in either of our daily offices,—nothing, in fact, which, as a matter of principle, a layman might not say.” It might be well for Mr. Flanders and his Clementine Fathers to make themselves better acquainted with the “principles,”—the *Eucharistic ideal*,—of their own leaders, before they commit themselves unreservedly to what they may wish to retract.

We append this note for the express purpose of relieving our good friends on the other side from the disagreeable task of denouncing us as a Puritan and a Calvinist and what not, for entertaining such “unchurchly” sentiments as those above expressed.—Is Dr. Lee, peradventure, a “Protestant Episcopalian?” Probably not, as he places “Thomas Cranmer and Oliver Cromwell” together as having been the arch-enemies of the English Church.

gospel—he has received “power and commandment” to preach it. This, by virtue of his ordination and without a special license, the deacon may not do, any more than he can pronounce the formal declaration of absolution; but this is merely a matter of ecclesiastical order. Unquestionably, the Church, if she saw fit, could authorize the deacon, in the absence of the priest, to pronounce the absolution, as well as to baptize infants. Does not the deacon thus administer the very sacrament for the remission of sins?

The Homily on Repentance, speaking of the Romish doctrine of auricular confession, answers the argument from the words, “Go show thyself to the priest,” thus:—

“Do they not see that the leper was cleansed before he was by Christ sent unto the priest? By the same reason must we be cleansed from our spiritual leprosy. I mean our sins must be forgiven us before we come to confession. What need we then to tell forth our sins into the ear of a priest since they be already taken away?” The general public confession, therefore, is all that is needed. Says Cranmer: “Christ himself, in his own person, made a sacrifice for our sins And the benefit hereof is in no man’s power to give unto another, but every man must receive it at Christ’s hands by his own faith.” Vol. i., 47.

“The difference between the priest and the layman in this matter is only in the ministration To them” (the ministers of Christ) “have been committed the keys of heaven to let in and shut out *by the ministration of his word and gospel.*” Page 350.

Says Latimer: “A minister is a more fit name for that office; for the name of priest importeth a sacrifice.”

"I may absolve you as an officer of Christ *in the open pulpit* in this wise: 'As many as *confess their sins unto God* and believe that our Saviour *hath taken away their sins*, and have an earnest purpose to leave sin; as many, I say, as be so affectioned' I, as an officer of Christ, as his treasurer, absolve you in his name.' This is the absolution that I can make by God's word." But if any are still troubled in conscience, he advises them to seek counsel from some godly, learned minister. Vol. i., 424.

Jewel, whose "Apology," like Melanchthon's among the Lutherans, was received by the men of his time, and long afterwards, as a sort of public or authoritative document of the English Church, says: "We say that Christ hath given to his ministers power to bind and loose, &c., and that the office of loosing consisteth in this point: that the minister should either offer *by the preaching* of the gospel the merits of Christ, and full pardon to such as have lowly and contrite hearts pronouncing unto the same a sure and undoubted forgiveness or else the minister, whenever any have offended their brothers' minds by any great offense After perfect amendment doth reconcile them and restore them to the company of the faithful." Part II., chap. iv.

"Touching the keys wherewith they may either shut or open the kingdom of heaven, we say, with Chrysostom, they be 'the knowledge of the Scriptures;' with Tertullian, 'the interpretation of the law;' and with Eusebius, 'the word of God.'"

He declares that the ministerial *power* is, to—

"Publish abroad the gospel, and be unto the believing a sweet savor of life unto life, and unto the

unbelieving and unfaithful a savor of death unto death ; and that the minds of godly persons being brought low by the remorse of their former life and errors, after they once begin to look up unto the light of the gospel and believe in Christ, might be opened with the word of God, even as a door is opened with a key." Part ii., chap. vii. Harding, Jewel's Jesuit antagonist, charges that thus the office of preaching and of absolution are confounded, and says if this be all, then why may "not every layman, yea, women, young boys and girls, assoil sinners?" The words of Christ, he says, are plain, "whosoever sins," &c., and argues that without absolution "the priest hath no special power;" in short, he uses just the reasoning which we could easily fancy Mr. Flanders's "fathers" to use, and which was used by the late Bishop of Exeter, who said that if to absolve be only declaratory, then his "verger" could do it as well as himself. To all which Jewel replies, quoting Augustine and Theophylact, that "laymen do bind and loose when they reject from or receive to fellowship a Christian brother," and that the doctrine thus ridiculed ought not to be strange to one whose church allowed an "old wife or young girl" to administer baptism in an emergency. "Now, good Christian reader, I beseech thee, examine a little the truth of Mr. Harding's tale. First he saith: 'The reciting and rehearsal of all sins before the priest is necessary to salvation.' Chrysostom answereth: 'Let God alone hear thy confession.' There is one untruth. Mr. Harding saith: 'General confession is not sufficient.' Peter Lombard answereth: 'Without any confession made by mouth, our sins may be forgiven.' There are two untruths. Mr. Harding saith: 'Confession of all sins

is commanded by Christ and His apostles.' His own gloss saith: 'It is only a tradition of the Church, commanded neither in the Old Testament nor in the New.' There are three untruths. Mr. Harding saith: 'It was commanded unto us by the doctors and fathers of the primitive church.' Rhenanus saith: 'We read not that this kind of privy confession in the old times was ever commanded.' And his own gloss saith: 'In the time of St. Ambrose, which was four hundred years after Christ, perhaps it was not used.' There are four and five untruths. Mr. Harding saith: 'It hath ever been allowed by all the learned doctors.' His own Gratian answereth him: 'The contrary hath been maintained and favored both by wise and by godly fathers.' There are six untruths. To be short, Mr. Harding saith: 'It hath been commanded to us by the general use of the whole church.' Theodorus answereth him: 'The whole church of Grecia useth it not.' There are seven apparent and great untruths." Def. Apol., II., vii., 2.

Harding had admitted that "the express term of secret or auricular confession is seldom mentioned in the ancient fathers." Says Jewel: "If he had left 'seldom,' and said 'never,' I know this tale had been the truer. That confession that the holy fathers have so often spoken of was made not secretly or in a corner, but publicly and openly, and in the sight of the congregation." "All this notwithstanding, albeit Mr. Harding were able to prove that the fathers had somewhere made mention of confession in secret, yet should not that greatly either further his purpose or hinder ours. For, abuses and errors removed, and especially the priest being learned, as we have said before, we

mislike no manner confession, whether it be private or public. For as we think it not unlawful to make confession before many, so we think it not unlawful, abuses always excepted, to make like confession in private, either before a few, or before one alone; and as the holy fathers, upon good considerations, were forced to remove the use of open confession, even so we say that upon like good considerations private confession may also be removed." Def. Apol., p. ii., ch. 7. Our readers can judge whether this whole passage is in favor of secret or auricular confession or not, and yet it is from this last passage that the prompters of Mr. Flanders have led him to cull his only citation from Jewel. Yes, Mr. Flanders quotes Jewel among his authorities. Is he ready to adopt, or as he says, "endorse," this plain teaching of Jewel? If not, then on his own principles "he ought never to have mentioned his name."

Hooker treats of absolution in the sixth chapter of Book VI. of the Ecclesiastical Polity, where he says:—

"As for the ministerial sentence of private absolution, it can be no more than a declaration what God hath done. It hath but the force of the prophet Nathan's absolution, 'God hath taken away thy sin'; than which construction, especially of words judicial, there is not anything more vulgar (common). For instance, the publicans are said in the Gospel to have 'justified God'; the Jews in Malachi to have 'blessed' proud men, which sin and prosper; not that the one did make God righteous or the other the wicked happy, but to bless, to justify, *to absolve, are as commonly used, for words of judgment or declaration, as of true and real efficacy.*" He then quotes

the Master of the Sentences and St. Jerome to the same effect, viz., to show that absolution is only declaratory. vi. 8. He charges the Romanists with self-contradiction, when they make such lofty claims for the power of priestly intervention, while their "learnedest rabbis grant that 'whosoever turneth to God with his whole heart hath immediately his sins taken away.' When those who are thus pardoned of God shall come to be also assoiled by the priest, I would know what force his absolution hath in this case. Are they able to say here that the priest doth remit anything? Yet, when any of ours ascribeth the work of remission to God and interpreteth the priest's sentence *to be but a solemn declaration* of that which God himself hath already performed, they scorn at it." *

"They urge against it that if this were true, our Saviour Christ should rather have said, 'What is loosed in heaven, ye shall loose on earth,' than, 'Whatsoever ye loose on earth shall in heaven be loosed.'" vi., 12.

At length he concludes: "The further we wade the better we see it still appears that the priest doth never in absolution, no, not so much as by service and ministry, really either forgive the act, take away the uncleanness, or remove the punishment of sin, but if the party penitent come contrite he hath absolution before absolution; if not contrite, although the priest should ten thousand times absolve him, all were in vain." vi., 13. Is that plain enough? Did Hooker suppose that the English—not to say our—Church agreed with Rome "on the power of the keys and auricular confession"?

* See not only Harding, the Jesuit, but the late Bishop of Exeter, and the ritualistic school in general,—“they scorn at it.”

After this will the Clementine Fathers assure us, with Sadler, that "absolution is not merely declaratory. It must in some sense convey what it declares. The words of Christ are too strong for a merely declaratory absolution," &c.? Was Hooker a Pennsylvania Protestant Episcopalian? Is he to be set down as an ignoramus, one who "*don't* reason, who *don't* put things together," one who is innocent of any knowledge of antiquity?

Will Mr. Flanders "endorse" those sentiments of Hooker? If not, "he ought never to have mentioned his name." As for the tradition that Hooker confessed to Saravia and received private absolution, if it is true, it certainly cannot mean that Hooker expected from that absolution anything effectual to procure or convey to him the forgiveness of his sins, but it was purely for its subjective effect, simply for the comfort, the consolation, he might thus receive from the ministry of God's word.

Bingham says: "Upon an exact inquiry there appear to be these four acts of the ministry whereby the benefit of absolution is ordinarily dispensed unto men :—

"1. The power of administering the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

"2. The power of publishing the terms or conditions upon which the gospel promises pardon and remission of sins, which is called the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine.

"3. The power of interceding with God for pardon of sins through the merits of Christ; which is the absolution of prayer.

"4. The power of executing discipline and censures upon delinquents . . . and receiving penitents again into communion."

Now, this is not an *obiter dictum* of Bingham, but a judgment upon the case; an articulated, systematic, exhaustive statement. Under the second, the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine, he expressly includes the general declaratory absolution retained in the daily service. "Faith," says he, "comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. And men do not ordinarily hear without a preacher, nor ordinarily preach except they be sent. Therefore, as it is necessary they should believe and repent and obey the gospel, so it is necessary they should hear the general declarations of pardon which God has made in his gospel on the one hand, and the declaration of wrath revealed from heaven on the other hand, in order to engage them to comply with those terms upon which the gospel makes the remission of sins to depend; and as the heralds of the gospel are obliged to preach and declare the mind of God," &c. All which is plainly Latimer's absolution from the pulpit in preaching the gospel. Further he adds:—

"As to a general absolution upon a general confession which is retained in our liturgy, and is a defect in Calvin's, though it must be owned to be a very useful and edifying part and form of divine service, which Calvin wished to have inserted into his liturgy, but could not obtain it, yet we cannot say it is so necessary a part of divine service as that *no church* can have absolution or remission of sins without such a form of absolution in her liturgy. For this would be

an unwarrantable condemnation of all *churches** that want that particular form, though they otherwise supply it by preaching, which is the declaratory application of God's promises of pardon to his "Church."

Besides the general declaratory absolution, and the precatory absolution, or absolution of prayer, Bingham speaks of a "more particular declaratory absolution necessary to relieve a distressed and wounded conscience," adding, "it is not simply necessary for all men, but *only* for those whose condition is such that they cannot have *peace and satisfaction* without it."

"As to the form, *absolve te*, it is agreed by learned men that it was not known in the practice of the Church much before the time of Thomas Aquinas, who was one of the first who wrote in defense of it, about the year 1250, against another doctor who maintained that the ancient form of absolution in the Church was not this indicative form, but an impetratory form, by way of prayers, deprecation, or benediction. . . . Morinus proves at large, out of all the ancient rituals and fathers, that the old forms of absolution were all by the way of prayer," like the second form in our service. And Bingham adds: "This power (of using the formula, 'I absolve thee') is only ministerial, not authoritative properly." "This form is understood to be no other than the declaratory absolution upon a special and particular case . . . but . . . notwithstanding the favorable sentence and judgment of the priest, God will judge the man again." He then, with Hooker, refers to Peter

* "Churches,"—observe he says, "churches" and not "the sects," or "the denominations." Bingham, though "a very modern divine," had not, it seems, learned the latest style of Catholic eloquence.

Lombard and St. Jerome, who teach that the absolution of the priest is like the cleansing of the lepers by the priests under the old law. They did not make them clean, but declared them so, and might err in their sentence. In short, the "I absolve thee" is simply equivalent to a solemn declaration, "God absolves all who truly repent; in my best judgment thy repentance is sincere; therefore I conclude that God hath taken away thy sin."

Bingham's Works, Vol. VIII., pages 425, 427, 428, 432, 444, 454.

Such is the interpretation of Jewel and Hooker and Bingham, and if this formula were not grievously liable to other and false interpretations, it might well be retained. Its practical value would, after all, depend upon the discretion, the sound judgment of the minister. Such a solemn judgment of a discreet and learned minister of God's word might well afford comfort to a troubled conscience or to a dying man.

We have thus examined Cranmer, Jewell, Hooker, and Bingham at large. We have no time or space to follow with the other divines of the Church of England cited by Mr. Flanders in favor of private confession and absolution. But we entertain no doubt that, with the exception of those of the Laudean and the later Oxford and ritualistic schools, they will all be found to hold substantially the same views of the nature of priestly absolution as Jewel, Hooker, and Bingham. And if such views were honestly taught and inculcated upon the people, the practice of private confession and absolution, as authorized by the Church of England, might well be allowed; and we should not be frightened

at all if Mr. Flanders or his kind purveyors of authorities should empty their storehouse at once and publish Dr. Pusey's book entire, with its whole stock of quotations made ready to their hands.*

But, as we have said, these provisions of the English liturgy were known to have been misinterpreted and abused at the time our liturgy was prepared and set forth. They had been made the occasion of many superstitions—of spiritual despotism and priestly tyranny—of bondage and disquiet to weak consciences. They were not *necessary* for the good purposes for which they were originally intended. Our Church, therefore, expunged them all with a firm hand.

For determining what is the doctrine of the Church of England, we assume that Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, and Bingham are as high and decisive authorities as can be appealed to. But it is constantly to be borne in mind that the real question here is, not what "the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church" teaches, not what the Church of England teaches, not what the great English divines "whose fame survives" teach, not what our

* As for the names of great divines taken from Dr. Currie's pamphlet, and brandished in the doctor's face with so much gusto, as though the doctor had cited them as witnesses against private confession and absolution, even in the cases allowed by the Church of England, all this is waste and more than waste bravado. It is a gross mistake, or a base misrepresentation. Any one will see, by recurring to Dr. Currie's pamphlet, that these names (besides Hooker and Bingham) are referred to in connection with Mr. Hunter's claim, that all the learning of the English Church, all, or nearly all the famous divines, were on his side of the house; and these were suggested as belonging to what is commonly called the Evangelical or Low Church school; and, as such, we believe they are most of them generally regarded. It was not intimated by Dr. Currie that they were opposed to such private confession and absolution as is authorized in the English Church—interpreting absolution as they would interpret it, and guarding against abuses.

own Church does *not forbid*, but what does the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States positively teach on auricular confession? Among the fifty and more authorities which Mr. Flanders has cited for auricular confession, there is not one name from the fathers and founders of our American Church. His are all English authorities. He has elsewhere styled Bishop Seabury "the first bishop and great apostle of our Church in this land." He seems not to consider him as tainted with "Pennsylvania Protestant Episcopalianism." We shall do Mr. F. a favor, therefore, by adding Bishop Seabury's testimony to that of his fifty. In his discourse on the "Apostolical Commission" (John xx. 21-23), having expounded it as including preaching the word, administering the sacraments, and censuring or reconciling offenders, he adds, without the slightest allusion to hearing private confessions and giving absolution as being contained in that commission, "These, in the general terms in which I have mentioned them, are sufficient to give an idea of the nature and use of binding and loosing, remitting and retaining sins, which Christ gave to his apostles. And it will appear from the view we have taken of it, that only open and known crimes and immoralities, such as disturb the peace of the Church and bring scandal on our holy religion, can be cognizable by the governors of it. As to secret sins, they can be known only to him who searcheth the hearts, and he will give unto every man according to his works. Exhortations to purity of heart and holiness of life, to constant penitence and lively faith in the atonement of the Redeemer, to a steady attention to the means of grace, with proper

cautions against the danger of resting in them, without the inward sanctification of the heart, together with plain instructions in Christian knowledge and virtue, *are all* that a Christian minister can, in this respect, do for his flock; and if he add the force of his own example, and become their pattern in holiness and piety, *he fulfills his duty*, and will receive the approbation of his Lord." Truly, Bishop Seabury, "the first bishop and great apostle of our Church in this land," seems to have almost as little sympathy as Dr. Currie with the confessional when considered as a means of promoting a higher life. Most likely he was only a Protestant Episcopalian after all.

But the positive teaching of our Church is contained in her Prayer-Book. And there she neither teaches nor authorizes nor even recognizes at all, from beginning to end, any such thing as auricular confession to a priest, accompanied with priestly absolution,—with the solitary exception of one extreme case, that of a criminal under sentence of death, and the exception only proves the rule. This is no departure from the doctrine of the Church of England "in any essential point," unless the Church of England makes such confession necessary to salvation, which, confessedly, she does not.

So much for "the religion of the Prayer-Book," and it is very noticeable that under this head of "Auricular Confession" Mr. Flanders has not been furnished with a solitary authority from any "ancient liturgy" or any "early father." We challenge him to produce one such authority in favor of secret, solitary, and particular confession to a priest of all one's sins with a view to receiving priestly absolution. He

would lead his readers to suppose that he has command of the whole compass of ecclesiastical and theological lore ; let him examine his treasures. He can tell us "what are the teachings and doctrines of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church." Let us humbly sit at his feet.

As to "the religion of the Bible," it is equally noticeable that under his other heads of Sacrifice, Real Presence, and Eucharistic Adoration, Mr. Flanders cites but one solitary text from Holy Scripture, which he mistakes ; together with the words of institution, which he grossly misinterprets. But here, under Auricular Confession, besides a long discussion of the text (John xx. 21-23), which, as we have seen, is interpreted by the Reformers and Fathers of the English Church in a sense very different from that which he would put upon it, he proceeds to give quite a string of Scripture citations in defense of his doctrine. But he has been so careless in making them, it would seem most likely that he took it for granted nobody would trouble himself with any attempt at their verification.

In four of the eleven passages to which he has referred, viz., I. Cor. ii. 10, Lev. v. 56, Luke xvii. 11, and John i. 8, nothing whatever can be found in relation to the subject in hand, and the references are probably blunders. In truth, the remainder are scarcely more to his purpose ; but they have just enough relation to it to suggest the possibility that they might be wrested in that direction. It is very strange that "a member of the Philadelphia Bar" should have really made such a jumble as to confound auricular confession with public confession or confession in general. Yet that is just what he has done. It was dangerous

for him to assume so confidently that only he and Mr. Hunter had read their Bibles, and to count so largely upon the ignorance and obtuseness of his opponents. He offers examples of "confession before man," and then triumphantly asks if Dr. Currie can give one text against it? Dr. Currie would neither need nor desire to find one text against it. But we challenge Mr. Flanders and all the Clementine Fathers to give one text from either the Old Testament or the New, which either enjoins or recommends secret or auricular confession to a priest with a view to receiving his absolution. Give us one solitary instance in which either of the apostles ever heard such a confession;—and, in their ministry, of a large part of which we have a history, they must have had many occasions for exercising this most important function. How happens it to have been entirely overlooked? Were they negligent or unfaithful priests in the Church of God? Mr. Flanders is good lawyer enough to know that, in this issue, it is not for Dr. Currie or anybody else to bring texts against his doctrine. It is for him to prove that doctrine distinctly and positively from Scripture, if he would show that it belongs to "the religion of the Bible." There may be no text in Scripture against praying toward the rising sun; is it therefore to be held as part of "the religion of the Bible" so to pray? The true question is: Does the Bible command so to pray? If not, is Pennsylvania Protestant Episcopalianism to be charged with not being "the religion of the Bible" because its practice is to pray otherwise? Our Saviour Christ taught us to enter into our closet and pray to our Father in secret; and thus he taught his disciples to

pray: "Forgive us our trespasses." We do not understand that he thereby forbade public or common prayer; but he nowhere intimates that his disciples, when they would seek the forgiveness of their sins, should shut themselves up with a priest, to make their confession to him, and receive his absolution. He told them to go, each by himself, directly to our Heavenly Father, in his name, and say, "Forgive us our trespasses;" and, so doing, he has assured us of his absolution. St. James charges us, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another;" but he says no word of confessing to a priest or receiving priestly absolution. Even though it should be thought that the text or context might be explained consistently with the doctrine of auricular confession and absolution, it is abundantly clear that it does not *teach* that doctrine. And David says: "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and my iniquities have I not hid. I said I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." Ps. xxxii. 5. So in the fifty-first psalm, David addresses himself directly to God with his humble, penitent, heart-broken confession. To transform the scene between Nathan and David into that of the confessional is a ludicrous and shameless travesty. Nathan charges David with his sin; David humbly acknowledges it, and Nathan, being an inspired prophet (not a priest), assures him that God had taken away his sin. Is this to be set up as a case of auricular confession, and the fifty-first psalm to be framed into it? Is this the order and mode of proceeding in the confessional?

"But our Lord forgave sins, and he was a man, and was looked upon as a man." Yes; but he was also

God, and any man who is also God, "who knows all things," "knows what is in man," "knows the hearts of all men," may also have power on earth to forgive sins.

And "the great commission" itself, given to the ten apostles (John xx. 21-23), "whosoever sins ye remit," &c., may well be supposed to have applied to the apostles, who were endued with the miraculous power of discerning spirits and inflicting special judgments, in a sense far more absolute and literal than it will bear when applied to their successors of later times, whether bishops or presbyters; if, indeed, the commission, in its original and proper *intendment*, was not entirely restricted to the apostles themselves. When the words are now used in the ordination of priests, they are not understood as conferring the authority of transmitting the same commission to others. Why, then, it might be asked, must they be so understood as originally employed? Dr. Currie's suggestion (which Mr. F. scouts so vigorously) that this passage is parallel to Mark xvi. 19 and Matthew xxviii. 19, 20, would furnish the only textual or contextual ground for holding that the commission was to be perpetuated "to the end of the world." Has not our Church, with a right instinct, intimated that these words, even in the accommodated and modified sense in which they must always be now used, are more appropriate at the consecration of bishops than at the ordination of priests? *

* Dr. Currie had referred to Robinson's Harmony of the Gospels, and Mr. Flanders sets the doctor down with the crushing *dictum*: "Robinson's is not a book of any authority among scholars." Now, we care not at all to defend Robinson or the arrangement of his Harmony in this particular case; but we beg to inform Mr. Flanders that some "scholars" would be surprised at such a *dictum* from one of their own fraternity. In one sense, it is true, no harmonist is of any *authority* among scholars. Scholars take leave to think for themselves. Scholarship covers a much broader and more generous domain of knowledge

The words, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you," cannot mean that the apostles were sent *to do* the same which Christ was sent to do. The sending is like, the office is different. "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." "God sent forth his Son to redeem them that were under the law." Thus were not the apostles sent.

But we will not insult the intelligence of our readers by pursuing this Bible argument. We appeal, rather, to the readers of the Bible to say whether it anywhere teaches as a positive doctrine that men should habitually make a full confession of their sins secretly to a priest, that from him they may receive absolution? and that they cannot, as an ordinary thing, have any comfortable or scriptural assurance of God's forgiveness until they receive it from the priest, God's ambassador and minister? The Bible teaches abundantly that we should confess our sins directly to God, whether in public or by ourselves; and that when we have wronged our fellow-men we should confess our faults to them, seeking their forgiveness, not God's forgiveness from them. Meanwhile, the Bible certainly leaves us at liberty, even if it do not lay down any specific command to that effect, when our consciences are troubled and we cannot attain peace alone, to seek counsel and comfort

than the petty and stinted field so zealously cultivated in his school of churchmanship. A question as to the proper color or cut of an altar cloth, or the proper angle of a genuflection is one thing; a question of scholarship is another. He probably meant, in fact, that Robinson's is not a book of any authority among *ritualists*,—the terms, "ritualist" and "scholar" being, in his view, co-extensive;—but he may learn that even a member of the Philadelphia Bar needs something more than to become a ritualist, in order to be inoculated with all learning, and qualified to instruct the world, not only in the name of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, but also of universal scholarship. *Ne sutor supra crepidam.*

from any of our brethren, and especially from the ministers of God's word. And these ministers, when the Church so orders it, may give that comfort in the way of an intercessory prayer or of a declaration of God's forgiveness to all who truly repent and believe, and that in such solemn form as the Church may prescribe.

Our Church provides that not only a deacon but a layman may read in our congregations the daily service, including the confession, together with its prayers for forgiveness. Is that confession sufficient? May those prayers be heard? And may penitent believers then and there receive, in answer to those prayers, the forgiveness they implore? If not, why, then, this idle ceremony? And if so, what would a priest and his absolution add to it? Is it not clear that the Church agrees with Hooker and Bingham that the effect of the absolution is subjective rather than objective, that it is directed manward rather than Godward, that it does not affect objectively the fact of forgiveness, but operates subjectively in bringing an increase of comfort and confidence to the penitent believer?

Again, our Church provides that the master or *mistress* of any household may take order for family prayers; and, particularly in the evening prayer, provides a most beautiful and touching form of confession, and a prayer for pardon "to him who has promised forgiveness to all those who confess and forsake their sins." Is this all idle breath, because the priest is not there with his absolution? No doubt it might be better, more solemn, more comfortable, more edifying, if the priest were there,—even without his absolution.

Now let the people be taught this as the Church teaches it. Let them be earnestly instructed that "to God alone it appertaineth to forgive sins;" that Christ Jesus is "the only Mediator between God and men," "by whom alone we come to God," and "through whom we have freedom and nearness of access to the Father;" that he is our great High Priest, by whom "we may come boldly to the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy;" that the whole Primitive Church for many ages, and especially the Greek Church, had not the institution of the confessional and auricular confession, and, instead of absolution, simply prayed for the penitents; that our Church authorizes such confession and absolution only in the case of a criminal under sentence of death; that the proper, ordinary means of preparing for the Holy Communion—"the way and means thereto" as the Church teaches—even in case of the grossest offenders, is, "to bewail our own sinfulness, and to confess ourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment," making restitution when we have wronged others, and forgiving all who may have offended us; that it should be only in extraordinary and extreme cases of burdened consciences that any should need to open their griefs to the minister of God's word for godly counsel and advice; that this "opening of one's grief" does not involve a particular and private confession of all his sins to the minister; nor is such minister authorized in our Church to pronounce to such a penitent the forgiveness of his sins in any form of priestly absolution whatever, still less in a form ("I absolve thee") which is not contained in our Prayer-Book at all; that such habitual secret confession to the priest and

receiving his absolution, even if it were allowed, is neither necessary nor ordinarily conducive to a higher spiritual life; but that such a higher life is to be sought for by the diligent study of God's word and the right use of the sacraments which Christ has instituted, and in a constant, faithful, and humble walking with God, a near and filial communion with him through the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and faith in him. Let the people be faithfully taught this; and, though there would still be wounded consciences calling for special and personal counsel and comfort, there is no reason to suppose there would be more of them at St. Luke's Church (say) than at any other of our churches where they have the faithful preaching of the gospel of Christ.

In conclusion, let it be observed: (1.) That the whole *catena* of Mr. Flanders from English divines in defense of auricular confession, is in defense of such a use of it as is allowed in the English Prayer-Book. (2.) That all that use is utterly abolished in our Prayer-Book. (3.) That the defense, such as it is, is based upon a right view of absolution itself as being (aside from the administration of the sacraments and the dissolving of church censures), even in its strongest form, merely the declaration of an antecedent fact, or an intercessory prayer—never properly authoritative and absolute; and (4.) That the defense is always with the reserve that abuses are to be avoided.

Whether abuses exist or not will be betrayed by the results. If, in a given congregation, the people, or many of them, go habitually "to confession," especially in preparation for receiving the Holy Com-

munion, and are accustomed to talk of their "father-confessor," we are justified in inferring the existence of *abuses* in teaching and in practice, and a want of *conformity* to the liturgy of *our* Church by encouraging and hearing confessions and pronouncing formal absolutions.

We advertise Messrs. Hunter and Flanders, and all others, that we have not the slightest fear of the result of a thorough ventilation of the subjects above discussed in the light of "the Bible and the Prayer-Book." We have discussed them feebly, no doubt, but according to our poor ability—being only a Protestant Episcopalian; but "truth is mighty and will prevail."

We make no boasts of a life-long study of the subjects, or of great knowledge of antiquity, or of vast erudition of any kind. We do not feel competent to be the spokesman of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. We keenly feel the narrowness and insufficiency of our acquirements. And, perhaps, those gentlemen may find that it is just within the bounds of possibility for them to make some slight addition to theirs, before they undertake again to teach us poor ignorant Protestants, who "don't reason, don't reflect, don't put things together," what are "the teachings and doctrines of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church." We venture to suggest to them to ponder the advice which the king of Israel sent to the king of Syria,—“Let not him that girdeth on his armor boast himself as he that putteth it off.”

NOTE.—It was not until after the first part of this pamphlet had passed beyond our revision, that we understood Mr. Flanders had withdrawn the funny note which he originally appended to his pamphlet. That note was in both the copies which came into our possession. Had we known it was withdrawn we might still have alluded to it; but, out of regard to the gentlemen named in it, as well as in justice to Mr. Flanders, we should not have reproduced it.

3 1198 05523 6215



N/1198/05523/6215X

263.1

G635

Goodwin, D. R.

New ritualistic divinity

263.1

G635

177

3 1198 05523 6215



N/1198/05523/6215X

